The American Political Science Review

VOL. XLV MARCH, 1951 NO. 1

THE PRIMACY OF POLITICS*

JAMES K. POLLOCK
University of Michigan

In presenting my valedictory to this distinguished Association which has honored me by selecting me as its President, I should like to point out by way of introduction what has happened to this office, and therefore to me, during the past year. I have heard of one of my distinguished predecessors some twenty-five years ago who had little else to do as President of this Association than work all year on his presidential address. This was important work and I have no word of criticism of it. But the Association has changed, and today it leaves to the harried wearer of its presidential toga little time to reflect about the status of political science and his own impact, if any, upon it. An active Association life, now happily centered in our new Washington office, is enough to occupy the full time of your President, and universities as well as this Association might well take note. Therefore, in presenting my own reflections to you this evening in accordance with the custom of our Association, I do so without the benefit of the generous time and scholarly leisure which were the privileges of some of my distinguished predecessors.

Nevertheless I do base my presidential address today upon my own active participation in the problems of government, as well as upon my scholarly experience. I have extracted it in part from the dynamics of pulsating political life. It has whatever authority I may possess after having been exposed these twenty-five years to the cross-fire of politics, domestic and foreign, as well as to the benign and corrective influences of eager students and charitable colleagues. This change in the nature of presidential addresses reflects, I believe, the new role of the political scientist and the development of our profession.

---

* Presidential address delivered before the American Political Science Association at its forty-sixth annual meeting in Washington, D. C., December 28, 1950.

I

As our Association moves into a second half-century of activity, I am impressed with the seriousness of our responsibility. As I see it, our responsibility is primary because politics is primary and central to every great problem facing us today. There is nothing new about the central importance of politics, for Aristotle long ago referred to politics as the most sovereign of the sciences and as the master science. In his *Ethics*, he pointed out that it is "politics that determines what other sciences should be studied in states; which of them should be learned by each group of citizens; and to what extent they should be learned." " . . . observation," he continued, "shows that even the forms of capacity which are most highly esteemed—the art of war; the art of household management; the art of oratory—come under the control of politics." Considering the complexity of modern civilized existence, it is even more true today than ever before that political action is of primary importance. Little can be accomplished any more without reference to political processes.

Unfortunately, however, political scientists in their study of politics have not quite kept pace with the complex responsibilities which have been placed upon them. In the Greek city-state, responsibilities were few and of rather limited scope. In the modern world, our responsibilities are very broad and very compelling.

In the present state of national and international politics, a special responsibility also attaches to Americans. Particularly in the last decade new duties all over the world have been thrust upon us. As a result of the war, the United States, in various parts of the globe, is now performing services which a generation ago would have been thought impossible. Our role in the creation and in the operation of the United Nations is likewise of great importance. Our leadership in the programs of military occupation both in Europe and in the Far East have been a drain upon our resources and continue to pose serious problems for the United States. The unprecedented American economic aid and technical assistance under the program of Economic Cooperation have not only been a boon to world economic recovery, but have demonstrated to us the possibility of constructive action in raising the welfare level of human beings everywhere. More recently the Point Four program and our leadership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, not to mention our fathering of programs intended to facilitate European integration and Philippine rehabilitation, illustrate the extent and complexity of our international activity, and the measure of responsibility placed upon us. Our country, in a word, has been doing something new and distinctive and has assumed a role heretofore unknown to us.

We have not always sought the leadership of these programs. This leadership has been thrust upon us and as a consequence we have not always done our best, although it is clear to me that our contribution has been very great indeed. In some cases it has been almost providential that we have had a Clay, a Hoffman, a McCloy or a MacArthur to handle programs of great magnitude, complexity and importance. Lacking the experience and the trained personnel to undertake great programs, we have often had to improvise and we have sometimes found that our intentions and our programs have been misunderstood and misinterpreted. Any one familiar with our efforts to staff overseas agencies knows only too well how few Americans are really familiar with the other cultures of the world, and capable of working with them in a constructive way.

Despite unprecedented American activity and generosity, both our country and the world are, unfortunately, still afflicted with tensions. Our period has been well characterized as "the twilight of warlike peace." We are now in the midst of great defense preparations at the same time that we are attempting to carry on life and business as usual. Everyone asks, "Will there be war? Shall we have inflation? Must we stand still in other areas while we are putting the country in a state of defense?"

II

It is in this atmosphere, in this crisis situation, that I am called upon to discuss certain critical areas of our politics and to emphasize the responsibility of political scientists with respect to them. Such a discussion, I believe, will serve to emphasize the primacy of political considerations. Let me speak first of the impact of our new world position upon our government and our whole political life. Our new role in world affairs has placed new organizational requirements not only upon the State Department in particular, but also upon the whole government. In the words of the Report of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch:

> The Executive Branch today finds itself forced to develop positive foreign policies and programs involving not only the State Department, but many other departments and agencies as well and to deal cooperatively with other nations on a multilateral as well as a bilateral basis. The Congress, in addition, finds that the exercise of its traditional powers in the domestic as well as in the international field has made it a participant in the conduct of foreign affairs on an unprecedented scale.

The problems of government organization for the conduct of foreign affairs are, therefore, not confined to the State Department alone but involve the organization of the Presidency, the State Department and the Foreign Service, the departments and agencies other than the State Department, the interdepartmental relationships and the relationships between the Executive and Legislative branches.

In the "good old days," the State Department might have to handle a crisis or two every year; but now Mr. Acheson is faced with a major crisis almost every day. If the crisis does not develop overseas, it is almost certain to develop in some portion of the capitol! Adding to the complexity of the situation is the greatly increased size of the government as a whole and of the State Department in particular. Our foreign office now is almost five times larger in personnel than it was ten years ago, and in terms of appropriation nearly twelve times larger. In the interdepartmental field, there are more than thirty committees concerned with economic, social, military, and other aspects of foreign affairs. Of the fifty-four major departments and agencies in the executive branch, at least forty-six are drawn into foreign affairs to a greater or lesser extent. Statutory interdepartmental bodies, such as the National Security Council, have assumed greater importance. Certain units, such as the Department of Defense and the Economic Cooperation Administration, are deeply involved with the administration of occupied areas abroad and with financial assistance overseas. The Treasury Department, the Department of Agriculture, and the Commerce Department are important in international financial and agricultural matters, and also in connection with export control.

Congressional participation in the conduct of foreign affairs has become particularly evident in the expanding role of the House of Representatives in connection with appropriations for foreign programs. Under existing constitutional arrangements and structural provisions, the State Department has to operate under strictures and limitations which do not hamper any other foreign office in the world. When there is mutual cooperation and restraint between the executive and legislative branches, progress is achieved. But past experience points to the need of several important changes if our country and our people are to play a significant role in world affairs. Here, political considerations are primary.

Some of the necessary changes are organizational in character and have been dealt with adequately in the recent report to which I have referred. When the full effect of the reorganization of the State Department recently authorized by Congress has been felt, and when time has been given to allow the Department itself to work out the fundamental changes in its internal organization and personnel recently recommended to the Secretary of State—assuming always the support and sympathy of Congress—we will have a staff and an organization in our foreign office adequate to the traffic and requirements of our complicated world.

In two areas, however, we shall need to make important changes. One is in the administration of overseas affairs; the other is in the position of the United States Senate. On the latter point I should like to quote from the Report of the Hoover Commission on Foreign Affairs and then add a postscript. The report said:

> One serious procedural impediment to achieving satisfactory legislative-executive cooperation is the constitutional requirement of a two-thirds Senate vote for the confirmation of treaties. No thoughtful student of the conduct of foreign affairs can ignore the consequences of this provision. It is a serious trouble breeder between the executive branch and the Senate in that such an inherently rigid rule encourages circumvention by the executive by resort to the procedures of executive agreements and joint resolutions. Attempts to use these procedures, in turn, involve friction between the Senate and the House of Representatives. An especially bad result is that the emphasis is directed to the question of whether the proper procedure is being employed, instead of to the substance of the issues before the Congress. The question of a change in the present requirement of a two-thirds Senate vote is deemed, however, to be outside the province of this Commission.

Speaking now as a responsible political scientist and not as a member of a government commission, I should like to recommend that the power of the Senate over treaties be modified in the light of present world and domestic requirements. Many of my distinguished colleagues have previously recommended an amendment to the Constitution by which treaties should be confirmed by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress instead of by a two-thirds vote of the Senate alone. Such a change, in my view, is eminently fitting and necessary. It arises not from any desire to lessen the effectiveness of the United States Senate, but rather from the necessity of bringing the present constitutional provision into accord with the requirements of present international life, both at home and abroad. When one considers the speed with which international developments are moving today, not to mention the procedures of other countries with which we are now having close and friendly relations, it would seem reasonable to press at this time for a constitutional change. It is possible, of course, that difficulties between the Senate and the Executive in foreign affairs can be eliminated by other means, but I think it is doubtful.

With respect to the administration of overseas affairs, I feel a special urge to press for some prompt re-tooling of this part of our organization for the conduct of foreign relations. The Korean War and the Bell report on the Philippines have recently been added to the new problems of the E.C.A., the North Atlantic Treaty organization, and Point Four, to emphasize how the American government has developed vast overseas operating agencies to alleviate suffering and to ameliorate economic conditions all over the world. Among other things, these new activities require a new type of public servant. Without disparaging our military or diplomatic personnel, it is, I believe, quite correct to say that specialized administrative and technical qualifications are necessary for the successful operation of these huge overseas ventures. We have done, in my opinion, amazingly well under very trying circumstances. But I should be less than frank if I did not also say that the development of a corps of career men, trained for overseas operations, as distinguished from the training now provided for the foreign diplomatic and military services, is urgently required. The magnitude and importance of the problem is grasped when one recalls that there are now almost as many federal civilian employees outside the United States as in the city of Washington.

Furthermore, it is no longer possible to have a unified foreign policy, if we do not have a unified administrative center in Washington under the policy direction of the State Department. The recent Gray report on foreign economic policies has shown very admirably how all aspects of American foreign policy, political, economic and military, must be interlinked, and a proper organizational home provided. It might be well to add that coordination and unification of all overseas administrative activities in Washington will be without full effect unless we achieve the same degree of unification under each of our foreign missions abroad. It is just as bad to have several spokesmen for America in a foreign capital as it is to have several of them in Washington.

We also should not forget that the appropriations for providing participation by the United States in international organizations and conferences exceed the combined appropriations of the State Department and the Foreign Service. In the active international arena in which we are now very well supplied—not to say almost overwhelmed—with all kinds of functional organizations and international conferences, it becomes increasingly important that our government should promote efficient arrangements and procedures for our activities in these international organizations. Otherwise, we will not get value received for our expenditures, and our foreign commitments will become confused.

Another factor of supreme importance is the close collaboration betweeen the State Department and the Department of Defense. Similar close coordination between foreign and military policy now, I trust, happily on the way to realization, will avoid the bickering, the delays, and the fatal mistakes which characterized clashes between these two arms of our government toward the end of the war and immediately thereafter.

Finally, if in addition to this improvement in the structure and operation of our foreign policy, we could at the same time achieve a more responsible and cooperative relationship between Congress and the State Department, we should then have the basis for a popular understanding and support of foreign policy which now seems to be lacking.

In a well functioning democracy, the people must also be associated with policy-formulation. As long, however, as the responsible agencies of the government continue to pull and haul and to confuse the public about the great issues confronting the world, there is little chance for the citizen to participate with any degree of satisfaction or confidence in helping to decide great international questions. All of these problems are of primary importance and all are political.

III

The reorganization of our conduct of foreign affairs is only part and parcel, however, of the much larger problem of adapting our whole democratic structure to the increased needs of the time. "We need," as John Gaus puts it effectively, "a theory of government functions and one of the classification, recruitment and education of the personnel to administer them that are reflective of the conditions of *big democracy*." I have not yet recovered, in fact I am not sure that I ever will, from the shock I received when I recently observed and scrutinized from an unequalled vantage point the whole vast, sprawling edifice of the federal government. It takes a man of great hardihood to look at, let alone understand, the budget of the United States with its thousand-odd pages. But the experience of being regaled for two years with all of the facts and figures relating to the organization and functioning of the huge federal structure which spreads over all of this country and over all of the world, has naturally left on me some lasting impressions which I still find difficult to express.

Despite unprecedented achievements in reorganizing the federal government, much remains to be done. One trouble, of course, is that so much more than government in the formal sense is involved in government reorganization. If someone, more statesmanlike than the average, is seminal and vital and penetrating in his proposals, he immediately encounters the entrenched and the selfish interests which consider themselves to be adversely affected by these recommendations. The great extravaganza which is staged every year in Congress, an extravaganza which the late Will Rogers one time referred to as "Rivers and Harbors" or "I'll Get Mine," is a case in point. Here again it is the politics of the problem, and not merely its administration, which must be solved.

Even when it is essentially a bureaucratic responsibility and opportunity, much pushing by citizens is necessary. I still catch my breath when I reflect on how the President, not merely President Truman, but any President, must decide great questions. Even the very smart Budget Bureau does not know, or finds it politic not to enquire, who is doing what and when and how in the President's office. The idea of a career staff secretary, such as was recently recommended by our Commission after a careful, and if I may say so, highly realistic consideration of the problem under our constitutional system, apparently does not appeal to those immediately around the President. Like staff reductions, such proposals must often be pressed from outside the bureaucracy.

The importance of pressure group opposition and bureaucratic neglect should not be minimized, as I will presently indicate. But it is very important to realize that the federal government has become so big and awkward that it is, in effect, out of control. So difficult is it to secure the cooperation of numerous officials and agencies involved in any program, and in all programs, that at any given time no one is on top of the heap. Bureau or departmental autonomy, statutory restrictions, overlapping jurisdiction, absence of coordination, poor staff services, and just plain bigness add up to a condition of lack of control—one might say "free-wheeling"—which is the opposite of that responsible democracy we seek. No political scientist has developed hydramatic control for government machines, or if he has, it has not yet been adopted.

It is still a source of amazement to me that otherwise sensitive and intelligent men should continue to pile billion upon billion and bureau upon bureau without much thought of the administrative and political consequences. It is hard for me to believe that any thoughtful person could still think that it was possible for any one agency to attempt to write, or even approve, the position classifications in the entire federal service. Or that the Congress of the United States should be so perverse and unlearned in the principles of financial administration as to continue to insist upon a system which runs counter to the almost unanimous views of those who have studied the question. It is disheartening and discouraging to find that even hospitals are bandied about with the same kind of financial and public abandon that characterizes the construction of a dam on Tombigbee Creek or the dredging of the Clatskankie! Even when the political scientist considers himself to be a sort of political pathologist and tries to view the whole scene with that scientific reserve and calm judgment which befits anyone whose appellation is scientist, he still feels like remarking with Ostrogorski that "God takes care of drunkards, of little children, and of the United States."

Perhaps, as Herbert Emmerich has remarked, "Our governmental institutions are better than we tend to think." But we must not forget that they are now assailed by new enemies and by reinforced old ones. At a time of national crisis we should not be tolerant of inefficiency, nor neglectful of popular control. A new compulsion is now present which should drive the Congress and the President to move with all speed in the direction of implementing the recommendations of the last few years which were designed to put our house in order for any emergency.

I cannot hope in a few brief moments to summarize all of my deep reflections about executive organization and about the relation of Congress to it. But I do want to demonstrate how political considerations are of primary importance and to say that we have only started along the road of integrating our economy, our defense, and our resources. Despite the reorganization of Congress and the progress which has been made toward executive reorganization, there still remains a vast area of inefficiency, duplication and lack of control which continues to be a menace to our free institutions. The great problem of executive-legislative relationships cannot be effectively tackled until both the executive and legislative branches are in such reasonable state of organization that one can think of having them work together successfully. As long as Congress fails to equip itself with adequate, unpartisan staffs and continues to rely almost entirely upon seniority to select its leadership; and as long as the executive branch continues to consist of a congeries of unrelated services, dependent upon and limited by a nineteenth century set of personnel regulations, just so long will the pattern of our federal politics be one of oscillation between executive bureaucracy and congressional oligarchy.

With the pedagogues now rushing to Washington for federal aid to education, I suppose it will not be too long until Washington, not content with generous grants to farmers and veterans, will be filled with strange new ideas of educational organization and expenditure, and one of the last fields left to the states and the localities will be dumped willy-nilly upon the overloaded shoulders of the federal government. Decentralization and deconcentration, which seem to be our only salvation, will then become nothing but empty words. This would be fatal indeed to our democracy. As Charles Beard one time pointed out, "Unless our administrative system is so constructed and operated as to keep alive local and individual responsibilities, it is likely to destroy the basic well-springs of activity, hope, and enthusiasm necessary to popular government and to the following of a democratic civilization."

There is not much use worrying about intergovernmental relations unless some effective limit is placed upon the power and activity of the federal government. No one can say with any assurance what the optimum load of the federal government can be. But it is my opinion, for whatever it may be worth, that we are now attempting in Washington and through the federal government much more than can be efficiently administered or popularly controlled.

I might suggest that we already have in the federal government unsolved problems of sufficient seriousness that we do not need to take on any more. For instance, in the very critical period ahead when national security will demand a large military budget, our time-honored devices for subordinating the military to civilian control are, to say the least, likely to prove to be inadequate. This whole field of civil-military relationships deserves the closest study and scrutiny. To involve the federal government in further new problems at a time when a question like this, so fraught with grave consequences for the future of our republic, is pending and unsolved, would seem to be utterly foolhardy and irresponsible. Progress in coordinating diplomatic and military planning, at least at the top, could easily be shattered if Congress attempts to rely merely upon its control of the purse-strings without insisting simultaneously upon what is necessary to develop firm lines of authority and accountability within the executive branch.

I cannot conclude my discussion of the labyrinth which is the executive branch, or the confusion in the Congress, without referring to the real menace of pressure group politics as it operates in the capital city. Harold Lasswell has not exaggerated when he wrote:

> National policy increasingly becomes a matter of deals made between national pressure group officials and the bureaucracy of executive departments and agencies. What the pressure organization is able to "deliver," more than ever depends upon what the officials of a centralizing government find it expedient to give.

It is deeply discouraging to the average citizen, as it is depressing to the trained observer, to find the public so frequently pushed around in favor of combinations of interest groups. "Aggression of groups and agencies against the people as a whole," as Mr. Hoover puts it, "is not a process of free men. Special privilege either to business or groups is not liberty." The unusual and plutocratic and extravagant atmosphere of Washington is in no small measure due to the unlimited resources of lobbies and special interests which find their outlet in some portion of the District of Columbia. This problem, although seriously affecting the whole functioning of the federal structure of government, must be remedied elsewhere than in Washington. Thus I come to the next point of my discourse.

IV

One of the major problems of our democracy, after all, is how to strengthen and improve our political parties. We cannot exalt and enthrone the citizen without at the same time utilizing the politician. Under our form of government the politician operates within the framework of the two-party system, which, over the generations, has acquired a peculiar form and certain peculiar habits. The special form and spirit of our party system has determined the whole character of our government. Party politics is therefore of central importance. Sooner or later in every discussion of government and politics in this country, one must come back to the organization and functioning of our political parties. Party organization by itself is of crucial importance; and although American political scientists are probably in advance of those in all other countries of the world in their understanding and analysis of party processes, nevertheless in the last decade we have tended to emphasize —some might say overemphasize—other aspects of our discipline. We now have it on the best authority that "in democracy all social classes, all economic interests, all expertise, planning and power are subordinated to politics." Until recently some enthusiasts had almost convinced us that there was nothing outside the administrative framework.

It requires little argument to demonstrate that effective popular government rests upon a proper functioning of the party system. In the United States, a basic prerequisite not merely to good administration, but to active citizen participation and control is a responsible two-party system. We know, however, particularly since the growth and change of the federal government in the last twenty-five years, that our parties and our politics have gradually become more and more confusing and frustrating, not merely to students of government but also to the sovereign citizens themselves. Alert to the great significance of this subject, our Association several years ago created a special Committee on Political Parties. That committee, under the chairmanship of Professor Schattschneider, has now, after the most commendable study of the problem, presented to us and to the country a keen analysis and a series of important recommendations. I commend this report to you and to the country, and express my deep gratification that it should have been completed and presented at this important turning point in our political development. I might add that having just come through, or one might say having just survived, another national election, we should be more than ever instilled with the strong desire for raising the level and improving the quality of party action. How to relate public action and public decisions to the legislative and administrative processes must ever remain before us as subjects requiring the most thorough and complete and constant study.

In this connection it is well to remember that graft, corruption, improper influence, excessive campaign expenditures, still constitute the Achilles heel of democracy. In the political arena as well as in the legislative and executive branches, we must be ever on the alert to detect and to ferret out influences and practices which interfere with the true expression of the popular will. The present investigation of the interrelation of gambling and politics conducted by one of our distinguished members, Senator Kefauver, is an encouraging case in point. In public elections today more is at stake than ever before, and as students of politics we must be more than ever active and alert to detect, understand, and explain to our fellow citizens the true import of political developments. Yes, politics is primary; everything else is supplementary and secondary. Although American political life is at times quite disorderly and confusing, it is still unwise and ineffectual to attempt to solve legislative and executive and administrative problems as if they were separate and distinct from the party process.

V

I have now presented a series of observations about government and politics in the United States which are deemed worthy of particular attention at this time. I come next to a discussion of the place of the political scientist in our new political and governmental setting.

As I remarked earlier, our present situation has been aptly referred to as the "twilight of warlike peace." What we used to refer to as "crisis government" has become chronic. Emergency conditions have become the regular and normal thing. We, as political scientists, would be derelict indeed if we did not throw the light on ourselves and on our collective work to see if we are now doing as significant work as is required, or as we are capable of doing. "Have the scales fallen from our eyes and has the lead gone from our feet?"

I have spoken earlier of Aristotle's reference to politics as "the master science." But are we working today in relation to all the social sciences as if we were the master, the coördinating, the integrating discipline? I think not. I believe that we are not as vital and active and significant as we should be, and I want to express my own view as to the reasons for the academic restraint and reserve which up to this time have characterized our activities. Our contributions are urgently needed; and although political scientists as individuals are now active and important in the various levels of our political and governmental life, I strongly hope for greater and wider activity by our Association.

Why are we so restrained? Perhaps our recent specialization and compartmentalization has weakened the significance of our work. Perhaps we, as a discipline, have a separation of powers doctrine which prevents us from cooperative work with brother political and social scientists. I realize, of course, the vastness of the subjects with which we deal and the natural modesty of political scientists to avoid the sweeping generalizations— and errors—which make some politicians and even some members of other disciplines, objects of pity or derision.

But after all, the political scientist is and must be a generalist. Just like the politician, who, as Paul Appleby puts it, "is the preëminent, practicing governmental generalist," the political scientist who studies, and who we know is called upon to advise the politician, must be a person who trains himself to deal with large, complicated problems. Acquaintance with all allied disciplines is necessary, for one can hardly be a generalist unless he is able to generalize from something—namely, the facts, procedures, and processes outside as well as inside his own profession. Even more necessary is the ability to take a set of facts and recommend a sound policy out of them.

John Gaus recently referred to economic and social policies which are "gaily—or grimly—urged today with almost no reflection" of administrative experience, and recalled how Margaret Cole frankly confessed to the neglect of political factors by a group of which she was an active member. "Gaily or grimly" is good, but with what grave consequences to our welfare! Government has more and more become so complicated that policy must be formulated, not by a specialist but by a generalist, if we are not to become, even more than at present, a loose confederation of modern feudal interests. What we need is a political scientist who, in the words of Sir Edward Bridges in his Rede lecture, "will be a good adviser in any field because he or she knows how and where to go to find reliable knowledge, can assess the expertise of others at its true worth, can spot the strong and weak points in any situation at short notice, and can advise how to handle a complex situation."

Of course we must not expect the best thought and the best men in our profession to be automatically transferred to the posts in government where they could do the most good. Unfortunately in these days of impoverished research, inadequate travel, heavy teaching loads, and impecunious living, we must not expect too much. In fact, it is one of our most urgent problems to release the abilities of our most mature scholars to work on the new and the difficult and the enormous problems which beset our world. We must not send a boy to do a man's work. Neither must we kill off the great minds we have already developed, in commuting between Washington and our seats of learning. It seems that both universities and governments have neither the heart nor any proper realization of what is necessary to assure the availability and full contribution of leading minds to the processes of government.

Herbert Emmerich has pointed out how we must recognize

> that no one of the serious problems of today and tomorrow can be answered by the specialized approach. The big questions of today and tomorrow are not just matters of public administration or of international relations or of administrative law or of public opinion or of political theory. They do not belong exclusively to any of the specialists in these subdivisions of our field. All the insights of the political science disciplines must be focused on these questions with a view to getting complete, not partial, answers—and in time to have some effect on action. We must break down the jurisdictional boundaries which divide us within our own field, and the jurisdictional jealousies, and work at these problems as complete scientists.

I cannot agree with my dear friend Charles Merriam when he writes that "the weal or woe of mankind in the coming years rests very largely with administration and administrators." I think it rests with politics and politicians in the broadest sense of these terms. My belief is that any narrow specialization is inimical to the primacy of our subject and to the success of government in a free society. It is the complete political scientist "skilled in the art and science of politics"—not just in theory, in law, in administration, but in politics—whom I espouse, because it is on him that so much depends.

One of our colleagues, who is in a position to know, pointed out to me how almost everything in government might be considered an economic problem. "Yet," he added, "when economists in government get together to develop a new policy, what they really talk about and what they really think about is politics. There is nothing wrong with this," he concluded, "because they must develop policies that are possible—and politics is, above all, the art of the possible. The only trouble is the tendency to approach essentially political problems in an amateurish way because of a failure to recognize their political character."

Another of my distinguished colleagues, who will remain anonymous, has asked me why "the other social sciences with their glamorous new vocabularies are playing so vigorously in our own backyards, including those of sample polling and political theory?" The answer in part is that we have not sufficiently utilized the materials and techniques available to us in related disciplines. We have been somewhat deterred, it is true, by the horrible gobbledegook, particularly of the social psychologist, and we have had no desire to subordinate the substance to the technique. No doubt the other social sciences can help us. But the almost overwhelming problems of the modern world can be solved only by our most mature minds, and political science is the integrating and synthesizing discipline. *The pulling together must be under our auspices.* Economic and social problems occur in their most vital form in the political-legislative-administrative processes, and we must use other social sciences and accept a definite leadership in our relationships to them.

It was, I believe, our own Charles Merriam who provided the inspiration and leadership for social science integration in this country. The first President of the Social Science Research Council, Robert Crane, was also a political scientist and his present successor, Pendleton Herring, is another of the stars in our political science firmament. It is in no narrow disciplinary way that I would insist on the primacy of politics in determining public policy. I have seen something of the mistakes which are made because too specialized minds are at times on top, and because a broad political judgment was absent. It is the task of the political scientist to synthesize everything which goes into the formulation and implementation of public policy.

I am not interested in jurisdictional conflict, and I believe in drawing more fully upon the anthropological, psychological, and sociological contributions which are available to us on a basis of interdisciplinary exchange. But I would be less than frank with you if I did not assert that foreign and military policy is hardly the task of the nuclear physicist and that power and bureaucracy and other similar concepts are being manhandled by the psychologists. Why? Partly because political scientists have not sufficiently used the other social sciences and partly because we are focusing too much attention on small problems without developing frontal attacks on large, significant ones.

Nevertheless, there are more practical and mundane reasons. The mere bigness of a problem like legislative-executive relationships, for instance, is almost beyond the facilities of political scientists, unaided and unsupported, to handle. Without the generous support of the Carnegie Corporation, it would not have been possible to produce our recent report on political parties and the party process. With the federal government devoting a billion dollars a year to research, mostly in the physical and biological sciences, it is only occasionally that funds are available for those really seminal and significant investigations into our vast governmental and political structure, which present conditions require. Political scientists and social scientists generally may therefore quite legitimately excuse themselves because of lack of adequate equipment and resources. The terrific and overweening development of science and technology has necessarily pushed us aside for the time being, but it will not be for long. An active committee in our Association headed by one of our greatly respected ex-Presidents, Arthur Holcombe, will soon make our judgment and influence felt.

Perhaps the most favorable development of our times in its effect on human welfare is the activation of the policy and program of the Ford Foundation. The work of its study committee, on which our President-elect served, has been correctly evaluated by Henry Ford II as "one of the most thorough, painstaking, and significant inquiries ever made into the whole broad question of public welfare and human needs." Its work and recommendations, which every member of this Association should read, were accepted unanimously by the trustees, and there is therefore now in existence, what never existed before in such ample form, financial support for large and significant research by political and other social sciences. No longer can we complain that resources are not available. The Ford Foundation can now redress the balance in favor of the social scientists.

I am tremendously impressed with the impact of this report upon our profession. It may well become the greatest boon to fruitful and constructive research and action in the political field we have ever had. As the President of this Association, I salute this significant development and express our deep satisfaction that now for the first time in our history we have the possibility, if we are good enough, to assume our rightful place in making "significant contributions to world peace," in "the strengthening of democracy," and in the other "areas for the advancement of human welfare."

In what I have said about the place of political scientists, and in the expression of my hopes and desires for a greater future for our profession, I would not have anyone think that we are not now playing a significant role through our leading members and in our research and teaching everywhere. Our Vice President today is Ralph Bunche, recently winner of the Nobel Prize, and there are many others who are indispensable as advisers and participants in the decision of public questions at all levels of government.

But I still think that we must step up the significance of our work. Political theory, for instance, could do much today in the development of a more adequate concept and understanding of the democratic way. We have not contributed as much as we should to the practical solution of international affairs—perhaps in the latter case because we have got-ten away from solid foundations in comparative government and international law. I also feel that we should not shy away from proposing remedial action once we have made our analyses.

Our training of political scientists leaves much to be desired. We should re-think and recast our graduate training programs so as to develop generalists who are acquainted with the other social sciences, as well as with the emerging and pulsating political life around them. The new generation of political scientists must have a stronger sense of their important mission, they must be better equipped to understand and handle the procedures of other related disciplines, and they must be trained in the evaluation of large situations and in the solution of big problems. Perhaps I should say with Plato: "that is the pattern according to which they are to order the state and the lives of individuals . . . making philosophy their chief pursuit, but when their turn comes, toiling also at politics and ruling for the public good. . . . "

Nor have we included in our profession many who are interested and active in public affairs, those whose research contributes materially to the knowledge of political life, but who are not academicians, and those who teach citizenship to the large mass of our people who never attend a college or a university. If our research is to have the practicality which it requires, and if the results of that research are to have maximum application, it is indeed time that we associate these groups more closely with our profession.

Now that we have been able to establish an executive office here in Washington, it is up to the membership to consolidate our gains, coordinate our research, broaden our avenues of influence, enrich our teaching, and enlarge the participation of our professional membership. We have a deep responsibility, as well as a unique opportunity, in this troubled world. If we will reconsider our whole field and make such professional reorganizations as are required to bring us abreast of our new responsibilities, we can say with Henry Stimson:

> Let them learn from our adventures what they can. Let them charge us with our failures and do better in their turn. But let them not turn aside from what they have to do, nor think that criticism excuses inaction. Let them have hope, and virtue, and let them believe in mankind and its future, for there is good as well as evil, and the man who tries to work for the good, believing in its eventual victory, while he may suffer setback and even disaster, will never know defeat.

THE KOMSOMOLS—A STUDY OF YOUTH UNDER DICTATORSHIP*

MERLE FAINSOD

Harvard University

One of the most striking characteristics of modern totalitarianism is the conscious attention which it devotes to the organization and indoctrination of youth. The Soviet dictatorship is unique in having set the pattern of such activity; it has carried it on at a level of intensity and over a span of time unmatched by its now defunct Fascist and Nazi rivals. A third of a century has passed since the Bolsheviks rode to power in 1917; the membership of the Communist Party is today overwhelmingly composed of a generation which not only came of age since the Revolution but which also largely served its apprenticeship in the Young Pioneers and Komsomols. And waiting at the threshold of power is a new generation of approximately 10,000,000 Komsomols and 13,000,000 Pioneers, from whose ranks the Communist élite of the future is to be recruited.

What has been the history of this effort to assimilate and discipline the new generations? What manner of training are they receiving? What values does the present leadership seek to implant in them? What motives operate to induce affiliation with the Komsomols? How is the Komsomol organized? What are the activities of its membership? How are the oncoming waves of Soviet youth relating themselves to the society which has produced them? To what extent are they deeply loyal to the present régime? Is there evidence of disaffection among them, and if so, does this disaffection present any important threat to the stability of the régime itself?

To put these questions is not to suggest that anything resembling conclusive answers can be deduced from the available data. Interpretations of the moods and attitudes of Soviet youth run a spectacular gamut. The official view of the Party leadership is that the younger generation is fanatically and passionately devoted to Communism. The counter-claim of some ex-Soviet citizens in emigration is that the whole body of Soviet youth is ready to rise up in revolt against the régime at the first opportunity. What the available evidence does seem to demonstrate is that neither of these polar positions can stand serious scrutiny. Even a cursory reading of the literature of self-criticism in the Soviet press yields sufficient denunciations of political passivity in Komsomol circles to cast grave doubt on the official picture of Soviet youth as an embodiment of zealous orthodoxy. On the other hand, interviews with Soviet defectors and non-returners, many of whom themselves passed through the Komsomol school, testify to the continued presence, though in diminished degree, of a hard core of fanaticism in the Komsomol which makes it impossible to treat the younger generation as entirely lost to the Communist cause.

---

* The author wishes to acknowledge the very generous aid provided by the Russian Research Center, Harvard University, and the Human Resources Research Institute of the Air University in making this study possible. He also wishes to express a strong debt of gratitude to Mr. Paul W. Friedrich, who was associated with him in interviewing Soviet defectors in Germany and Austria and whose reports on interviews with former members of the Komsomol have contributed invaluable insights into their motivations for affiliation and the sources of disaffection among them.

The observations which are reported here are based both on a consultation of official Soviet publications and on a series of interviews with some fifty Soviet defectors and non-returners who were at one time members of the Young Pioneers and Komsomol organizations.[1] There are serious problems of appraisal involved in reliance on either of these sources; taken together, however, they serve as a mutual corrective, and there are enough instances where the testimony is corroborative to induce some confidence in the results.

I. THE GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE KOMSOMOL

To understand the problem of the generations in Soviet terms, one must view it in terms of the historical perspective in which it has evolved. Every generation bears the ineluctable stamp of the strategic historical experiences to which it has been exposed. The history of Soviet youth, and indeed of Soviet society, has been a unique tale of turmoil in a turbulent age. The Revolution, the Civil War and War Communism, the N.E.P., the Five Year Plans, Collectivization, the Great Purge of 1936–38, World War II, and the years of strain which followed have all left their marks on succeeding generations of youth. Over most of the period, life has been lived in an atmosphere attuned to crisis, of dangers real and fancied, of super-human demands on youth, of endless emergencies and constant strife and tension. The casualties have been high. The Revolution has consumed its children as well as its makers. Like most revolutionary movements which attempt a sharp break with the past, the Communist leadership has placed its primary reliance on youth to generate the momentum of innovation. It was Lenin who wrote long before the Revolution, "We mean to leave the collection of weary thirty-year old ancients, revolutionaries 'come to their senses,' and Social Democratic renegades to people like the Constitutional Democrats. We always mean to remain the Party for the youth of that class to which the future belongs."[2]

Prior to the Revolution, the Bolsheviks maintained no separate organization for the younger generation. The reason was an obvious one. The cadres of the Party were themselves largely recruited from among student and factory youth. Through these cadres the Party sought to penetrate and exercise influence on the circles of student and worker youth which sprang up sporadically in the period of the 1905 Revolution and the years thereafter.[3] Indeed, a resolution calling for such action among students, introduced by Lenin at the Second Congress of the Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party in 1903 (when the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks were still organizationally united), represents the first recorded Party action in this area.[4] But until 1917, aspirations reached far beyond achievement, and the Bolsheviks remained a small sectarian group with little in the way of mass influence, either among the youth or their elders.

---

[1] The interviews took place in Western Germany and Austria during the Summer and Fall of 1949. The great majority of those interviewed had left the Soviet Union during World War II; a small minority consisted of recent defectors from the Red Army and the Soviet Military Government in Germany. For a general treatment of the attitudes of Soviet non-returners and defectors, see Merle Fainsod, "Controls and Tensions in the Soviet System," AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE REVIEW, Vol. 44, pp. 266–282 (June, 1950).

[2] Quoted in Klaus Mehnert, *Youth in Soviet Russia* (London, 1933), p. 49.

Even after the outbreak of the March Revolution, the Bolsheviks were slow to assume the initiative in organizing an affiliated youth movement. In Petrograd, the storm center of revolutionary activity, the leadership in youth organization was taken by an idealistic young student, P. Shevtsov, who attempted to turn the energies of youth in a cultural and non-political direction. Under his auspices, a number of young workers in the Petrograd factories were banded together in a league called *Work and Light*, which repudiated the class struggle and called upon youth "to join no party, but to work together ourselves according to the precepts of brotherly feeling. Above all we must aspire to enter life intellectually and morally mature, with steadfast views on honor and duty. Let us therefore take the torch of learning into our hands, but in our hearts there shall be room only for endeavor towards the goodness and beauty of life."[5] The program of the league called for a great expansion of schools, the foundation of a university for working class youth, the establishment of clubs and theatres, youth hostels and excursions into the woods to share the joys of nature.

The vagueness of this program, removed as it was from the immediate realities of political and economic struggle, provided the Bolsheviks with their opportunity to make a vigorous counter-appeal to working class youth. They sent their representatives into *Work and Light*, but only with the objective of attacking its program, winning support for their own views, discrediting Shevtsov, and eventually taking over the direction of the young workers themselves. Under the leadership of the twenty-one year-old Bolshevik V. Alexeiev, a *Socialist Association of Young Workers* was organized with a program based on the class struggle and calling for immediate measures to improve the working conditions of juvenile labor. Faced with a vigorous challenge from this group, Shevtsov's grip over his own league became increasingly feeble, and in August, 1917, *Work and Light* was disbanded by a vote of its own members. Meanwhile, the *Socialist Association of Young Workers* had expanded into a city-wide organization of working-class youth with a program copied largely from the Bolshevik model. By December, 1917, it had attained a membership of approximately 15,000.[6] In Moscow and other large industrial centers, organizations of young workers developed more slowly though the same process of Bolshevik penetration and capture of leadership repeated itself. By identifying themselves with the specific economic grievances of the young workers and calling for such popular reforms as the outlaw of child labor, the six-hour working day for young workers, the establishment of minimum wages, the provision of social insurance benefits, compulsory education free of charge until the age of sixteen, and the right to vote at the age of eighteen, the Bolsheviks succeeded in mobilizing considerable support among the more politically active working class youths in the large cities and, indeed, relied heavily on such support in their successful bid for power in November, 1917.

---

[3] *Bol'shaya Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya* [The Great Soviet Encyclopedia] (Moscow, 1930), Vol. 11, pp. 635–638.

[4] For a copy of this resolution see VKP(b), *O Komsomole i Molodyozhi* [On the Komsomol and Youth] (Moscow, 1938), p. 76. This volume is a valuable collection of the most important Party resolutions on the Komsomol for the period up to 1938.

[5] Mehnert, *op. cit.*, p. 53.

[6] *Bol'shaya Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya*, Vol. 11, p. 638.

The organization of a Communist youth affiliate on an all-Russian basis was delayed until almost a year after the November Revolution. The 176 delegates who foregathered for the First Congress of the Komsomol, or Communist Association of Youth, in Moscow from October 29 to November 4, 1918, represented an initial membership of only 22,100.[7] They were, as was to be expected, overwhelmingly Communist in their political sympathies, but also present was a scattering of non-Party youth as well as a few delegates from other left-wing groups still collaborating with the Communists. The major struggle at the Congress took place over the designation of the organization as Communist. There was fear expressed that this appellation would frighten youth away from affiliation, but these fears were swept aside by the majority. The Congress, although declaring itself an "independent" organization, expressed complete solidarity with the Party, and adopted the Communist tag by an overwhelming majority. At the Second Congress, meeting in October, 1919, with 96,000 members represented, the bond with the Party was drawn more tightly. Although the Komsomol was still declared to be an "autonomous" organization, the Congress not only expressed its adherence to the program and tactics of the Party, but recognized its Central Committee as immediately subordinate to the Central Committee of the Party.

During the Civil War period, all of the energies of the Komsomol were concentrated on the struggle against the Whites. The Komsomols were rushed to the front in successive mobilizations where they functioned as agitators, commissars, and shock troops, to provide leadership and inspiration for less dependable conscripts. But through the end of 1919 they remained a relatively small band, and it was not until the prospects of victory brightened during 1920 that they began to take on the character of a mass organization. By the time of the Third Congress of the Komsomols in October, 1920, membership had climbed to approximately 480,000.

The rapid growth in membership brought new problems to the fore. The Komsomol was not then as tightly controlled as it was later to become. It began to spawn deviations.[8] Even before the Second Congress, a group led by Dunayevski had been pressing for the organization of special sections of the trade unions reserved for young workers. This was denounced by the Party as an effort to pit the interests of young workers against their elders and as a syndicalist deviation detracting from the authority of the Komsomol organization itself. Dunayevski and others continued to urge wider mass participation in decision-making, but their claims were decisively rejected, and disciplinary measures were taken against the deviators. Restiveness under the central controls which were already beginning to consolidate themselves within the Komsomol found their expression in renewed demands for more organizational democracy and local autonomy. This position was strongly espoused by the so-called Ukrainian opposition, which also insisted on the exclusion of intellectuals from the Association. These oppositionist tendencies, which had their analogue in the Workers' Opposition within the Party itself, were sharply attacked and repudiated at the Third Komsomol Congress.

---

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 640.

[8] *Ibid.*, pp. 645–649; also VKP(b), *O Komsomole i Molodyozhi*, pp. 80–82.

The Third Congress marked the beginning of the turn from war to peace. In addition to adopting a new program and constitution for the Association, the Congress listened to Lenin sounding a new call: "The task before the elder generation of revolutionaries was comparatively simple. For them it was a matter of doing away with the bourgeoisie, of inspiring hatred for it among the masses, of awakening class-consciousness in the workers. The task before your generation is infinitely more complicated: the erection of the Communist society."[9] Lenin's injunction to the Congress to "learn, learn, learn," to master the knowledge that the despised capitalist society had accumulated, to practice discipline, and to seek proficiency in the prosaic tasks of school and workshop came as something of a shock. The shock was accentuated by the adoption of the New Economic Policy in the Spring of 1921.

After the romantic heroics of Civil War battlefields and War Communism, adjustment to the N.E.P. did not come easily. To many, N.E.P. appeared as a retreat from Socialism, a surrender after victory. Opposition to N.E.P. was lively and violent in Komsomol circles. A few of the more fanatic committed suicide in protest. Still others found it impossible to make the transition from military to civilian life and sank into a quagmire of despair as unhappy victims of the Revolution which they had helped create. Grumbling among young workers mounted as working conditions failed to register the improvement for which they had hoped and unemployment increased. Enthusiasm gave way to disenchantment, and the Komsomol organization itself underwent a crisis. By October, 1922, the time of meeting of the Fifth Congress, membership had plummeted to 247,000, and Party leaders became seriously alarmed.[10]

From 1922 on strenuous efforts were made to recapture and consolidate the loyalty of Soviet youth. One of the resolutions passed by the Fifth Congress provided for the organization of the Pioneer association to attract the pre-Komsomol generation and to condition and prepare it for Komsomol membership. Measures were taken to improve working conditions for young factory workers and to provide some degree of protection for them against unemployment by imposing a minimum quota of juveniles on every industrial undertaking.[11] The system of factory schools (FSU) was extended, thus making available a modicum of education to young workers in the factories. Efforts were also made to compensate for the weakness of the organization in the countryside by mobilizing Komsomol activists and sending them to the villages to recruit members and build up local organizations. Greater stress was placed on political indoctrination within the Red Army, where peasant youths called up for military service were more amenable to Komsomol blandishments than when exposed to cross-influences at home.

---

[9] Mehnert, *op. cit.*, pp. 60–61.

[10] *Bol'shaya Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya,* Vol. 11, p. 649.

As a result of these measures, the tide was reversed. By January 1, 1924, the membership of the Komsomol again passed the 400,000 mark.[12] By January 1, 1925, after the so-called "Lenin Levy," when the Party appealed to the youth to commemorate Lenin's death by closing ranks, membership rose to a million. The second million was reached in 1927, on the eve of the Five Year Plan.[13]

While the later phase of the N.E.P. registered substantial gains in membership for the Komsomol, the period was not without its problems. The level of political literacy was low, particularly in rural areas. Among the more politically alert, the grey dullness of the N.E.P. was not calculated to stir enthusiasm. The strong response which the Trotsky opposition, and later the block of Zinoviev, Kamenev, and Trotsky, received from the more educated and politically conscious stratum of the Komsomol organization becomes explicable against this background. Trotsky's call for world revolution evoked stirring memories of the first days of the Revolution and drew on a militant tradition of activism which the N.E.P. was by way of thwarting. The purge of the Left opposition within the Party left its scar on the Komsomol, though, as events turned out, the wound responded to treatment.

The initiation of the Five Year Plan in 1928 aroused an outburst of zeal and fervor among the Komsomols for which only the period of Revolution and Civil War furnished a parallel.[14] Here was an enterprise which in its immensity, its call for sacrifice, and its promise for the future was peculiarly suited to appeal to the idealism of youth. Komsomols were mobilized in the thousands to construct such industrial giants as the Stalingrad tractor factory, the Dnepropetrovsk electric station, and the new factories in the Urals and Siberia. They were drafted to work in the Don Basin when coal production lagged. They built a new industrial center on the Amur River in the Far East, named Komsomolsk in their honor. They were sent by the thousands to participate in collectivization, to liquidate the Kulaks, to help establish Kolkhozes, and to staff the new MTS (Motor-Tractor Stations). They set the pace as shock brigadiers, as Stakhanovite workers, and as leaders in socialist competition. They took upon themselves the task of stamping out illiteracy, and they crowded the newly established technical institutes to prepare themselves to become the engineers and industrial managers of the morrow.

---

[11] *Ibid.*, pp. 649–650.

[12] *Ibid.*, p. 649.

[13] *Ibid.*, pp. 653–654.

[14] See Mehnert, *op. cit.*

The outpouring of energy was impressive, yet the almost superhuman demands which the Plan imposed on youth also exacted their toll. The initial delirium of dedication to a new industrial project in the wilderness was succeeded by the more prosaic routine of daily irritations compounded of poor food, crowded housing, and the constant spur to make bricks out of straw. The more tender-hearted among the Komsomols were broken by the harsh realities of dekulakization and famine in the villages. As the Soviet novelist Gladkov put it, "These years are very difficult for our young people. They burn out quickly, overwork themselves, and suffer from nervous troubles; at the age of eighteen or nineteen many are either stunted or dried up and old in spirit. No fewer than one-third of the patients in the sanitarium are Komsomolites, and they are all like aged, used-up people, who have gone through a great deal already."[15]

It was the hard and the tough who survived. The sensitive and the weak dropped out as casualties by the wayside. Their places were taken by representatives of the oncoming generation recruited from the Pioneers. The size of the Komsomol organization continued to expand. By the time of the Ninth Congress of the Komsomols in 1931, membership reached the 3,000,000 mark. At the Tenth Congress in April, 1936, the membership approximated 4,000,000.[16]

The mid-thirties marked an important turn in the membership policies and program of the Komsomol. Until that period, the Komsomol had been regarded as a relatively exclusive class organization with membership primarily recruited from proletarian elements in the cities and the poorer peasantry in the villages. Admission was regulated on the basis of social origin, and the Rules of the Komsomol described it as "a mass organization, proletarian in its essence, uniting in its ranks the broad strata of the foremost, class conscious and politically literate youth."[17] At the 1936 Congress the Rules were modified to liberalize the conditions of admission. The Komsomol was to be "a mass non-party organization, affiliated with the VKP(b) [the Party], which unites in its ranks the broad stratum of the progressive, politically literate toiling youth of the town and village" with entrance determined not on the basis of social origin but in terms of the broader criterion of loyalty to the Soviet régime.[18]

This deliberate decision to widen the base of the Komsomol was accompanied by a marked shift of program. With the initiation of the Five Year Plan, the whole weight of Komsomol activity had been turned in the direction of emergency economic activity—the construction of new industrial plants, the organization of Kolkhozes, and the whipping up of enthusiasm for the manifold enterprises embraced in the Plan. In the process the Communist education of the youth was being neglected. "Some of our regional committees," reported A. V. Kosarev, the Komsomol secretary, "had become, so to say, some sort of small, sickly economic Narkomats [ministries] . . . . We have to remember that our basic task is the organization and Communist education of the youth and children."[19] Under the banner of Stalin's new watchword, "Cadres decide everything," the main task of the Komsomol was now declared to be Communist indoctrination of the youth. The Komsomols were not to participate in economic questions as actively as they had done before; their major attention was to be turned to the educational task. Programs were also to be developed to appeal more widely to youth. The Komsomol leadership was called upon to emphasize "cultural" as well as political work, to organize athletic competitions, ski excursions, musicales, dramatics, dances, and evening literary discussions in order to minister to the many-sided interests of youth and to attract its support. Under the impetus of these measures, membership grew sharply. By October, 1939, it had climbed to 9,000,000.[20]

---

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 91.

[16] Julian Towster, *Political Power in the USSR* (New York, 1948), p. 140. Also "Twenty Years of the Komsomol," *Partiinoe Stroitel'stvo*, No. 16, pp. 52–59 (August, 1938).

[17] A. A. Andreyev, "The Communistic Education of the Youth and the Tasks of the Komsomol," *Partiinoe Stroitel'stvo*, No. 9, p. 10 (May, 1936).

[18] *Ibid.*

The late thirties brought trials and tribulations as well as successes. The Great Purge of 1936–38 had its maximum impact on the Party, but it also struck the Komsomols hard. The central apparatus of the Komsomol was decimated; A. V. Kosarev, the first secretary, was removed, and many of the top functionaries of the organization disappeared with him.[21] At the height of the Yezhovschina, a veritable reign of terror was unleashed among Komsomols as well as Party members. Denunciations were rife in all the local organizations. Expulsions took place in the hundreds and thousands as the N.K.V.D. relentlessly pursued the so-called "Trotskyite-Bukharinist-German-Japanese-Fascist spies, diversionists, murderers, double-dealers, hostile elements, and enemies of the people" who were alleged to have infiltrated the Komsomol organization.[22] By the Spring of 1938, the Party leadership was prepared to admit that many mistakes had been committed in the course of the wholesale expulsions, and efforts were made to repair some of the damage by punishing "slanderers responsible . . . for unjust accusations" and restoring such of the victims as still remained alive to their former status in the organization.[23] But the heritage of bitterness left by the purge persisted, and its continuing effects were visible in the pattern of motivations of Soviet defectors during and after World War II.

---

[19] A. V. Kosarev, "On the Reorganization of Komsomol Work," *Partiinoe Stroitel'stvo,* No. 14, p. 8 (June, 1935).

[20] Towster, *op. cit.*, p. 140.

[21] See the attack in the editorial "Raise the Bolshevistic Vigilance of the Komsomol," *Partiinoe Stroitel'stvo,* No. 18, p. 8 (September, 1937).

[22] See, e.g., O. Smirnov, "Reshaping the Work of the Komsomol," *Partiinoe Stroitel'stvo,* No. 12, pp. 23–27 (June, 1937). See also P. Vershkov, "A Leninist-Stalinist Education for Soviet Youth," *ibid.*, No. 7, pp. 28–33 (April, 1938) where some typical expulsion figures are cited. In the Komsomol organization of Georgia, 1577 persons were excluded in the third quarter of 1937. Of these, 1182 were denounced as "hostile elements." In the Omsk region during the same period, 1101 Komsomolites were excluded, of whom 731 were denounced as "hostile elements and double dealers."

[23] See Vershkov, *loc. cit.*, p. 28.

Not all of the effects of the purge, however, were negative. The havoc wrought by the purge among the older generation was much greater than among the youth. In the process, many responsible posts in both the Party and governmental hierarchy were vacated, and the Komsomol activists who survived the purge were presented with magnificent opportunities for rapid promotion and access to positions of influence and large responsibilities. These young Komsomols who were catapulted to power over the graves of their elders were welded to the régime and incorporated in its leadership group.

Other developments in the pre-war years served to generate discontent among some members of the Komsomol rank-and-file. On October 2, 1940, the government instituted a system of tuition fees for the last three years of secondary education and higher schools.[24] At the same time it also established a state labor reserve scheme by which up to a million youths per year between the ages of fourteen and seventeen were to be drafted for training as industrial workers.[25] The introduction of tuition fees meant that those students who could not qualify for scholarships or were unable to draw on family resources to support them had to abandon their hopes of higher education. The advantages conferred on the financially better-situated left a reservoir of bitterness among those who were forced to withdraw from the higher schools as a result of the decree. At the same time the restrictions on access to educational opportunity and freedom of occupational choice, involved in the labor draft, also induced frustration and discontent. While it is difficult to appraise the significance of the dissatisfaction produced by these measures, the testimony of young Soviet defectors and non-returners is virtually unanimous in stressing the growth of a mood of disillusionment and disenchantment in that segment of Soviet youth which was most adversely affected.

The success of the Soviet army in surviving the Nazi onslaught and pressing on to victory may suggest that the mood was a passing one, or that in any case it did not go deep enough or was not widespread enough to affect the will to fight. Yet the problem of the loyalty of Soviet youth to the régime cannot be disposed of with a mere reference to the pragmatic fact of Soviet victory. The mass surrenders of the early days of the War point to a serious problem of morale, as well as to difficulties of matériel and generalship. All of the evidence available through interviews indicates that the mass atrocities committed by the Nazis in the course of their Russian campaign and the contempt with which they treated the Slav *Untermenschen* had much to do with stiffening resistance. Hatred of the Nazis unleashed a genuine and widespread national upsurge of feeling, which the Party leadership was shrewd enough both to stimulate and exploit. Communist slogans were muted, and the wellsprings of national sentiment were tapped to the full. The bars of admission to Party and Komsomol were lowered for members of the armed forces; the millions who enrolled during the War responded primarily to patriotic appeals. By October, 1945, the claimed membership of the Komsomol was 15,000,000, approximately half of the population in the eligible age group.[26]

---

[24] *Sobranie Postanolenii i Razporyazhenii Pravitel'stva SSSR*, 1940, No. 27, Sec. 637; 1940, No. 29, Sec. 698.

[25] *Vedomosti Verkhovnogo Soveta SSSR*, 1940, No. 37.

Since the end of the War, there has been a sharp drop in Komsomol membership. The last precise data, released on the occasion of the Eleventh Congress of the Komsomol in March, 1949, showed a membership roll of 9, 283, 289, a figure roughly equivalent to the 1939 membership.[27] No official explanations of this decline have been vouchsafed. The difficulty which has been encountered in compensating for the high attrition rate among war-enrolled Komsomols through new admissions, suggests a falling-off in the appeal of the Komsomol which may have considerable political significance. While the available evidence is too spotty to justify large-scale conclusions, it may be surmised on the basis of occasional hints thrown out in the Soviet press that some sectors of Soviet youth manifest a disturbing passivity toward Komsomol membership. Recent reports indicate considerable Party concern over the large number of automatic exclusions from the Komsomols as a result of non-payment of dues, failure to attend meetings, and unwillingness to discharge the social and political obligations that go with membership.[28] Since the Eleventh Congress (1949), the Komsomol leadership has been pursuing an intensified program of Communist indoctrination of the young and has centered a major portion of its activity on the schools. The slow growth in membership which has been reported since the Eleventh Congress may indicate that the organization is beginning to win back some of the ground which it has lost since the end of the war.[29]

The history of the Komsomols is a record of the persistent and strenuous efforts of the Party leadership to anchor itself as firmly as possible in the support of the oncoming Soviet generations. Despite these efforts, the experience of life under the Soviet régime has eroded loyalties, among the youth as well as their elders, and has made widespread use of repressive and disciplinary measures necessary. But it would be a mistake to assume, because terror and secret police are integral features of the Soviet régime, that the rôle of indoctrination as it expresses itself through the Komsomol or other channels can be dismissed as without significance. Each new generation as it grows to maturity offers the Party leadership a fresh opportunity to imprint its stamp upon it. The capacity of the totalitarian régime to mold the minds of the young while they are still plastic and malleable is a formidable weapon, the power of which should never be underrated.

---

[26] Towster, *op. cit.*, p. 140.

[27] See "Report of Mandate Commission, Eleventh Congress of the Komsomol," *Molodoi Bol'shevik*, No. 8, p. 67 (April, 1949).

[28] See, e.g., the following articles: V. Ershov, "Do Not Exclude Without Foundation but Educate" (On the Mistakes of the Kemerovsk Regional Committee), *Molodoi Bol'shevik*, No. 21, pp. 39–43 (November, 1949); Resolutions of the Second Plenum of the Komsomol Central Committee on the Work of the Komsomol Organizations in the Sverdlovsk Region and the Stalingrad Tractor Factory, *ibid.*, No. 1, pp. 33–34 (January, 1950); "On the Style of Work of the Molotovsk Regional Committee," *ibid.*, No. 9, pp. 30–37 (May, 1950).

[29] *Molodoi Bol'shevik*, in No. 23 (December, 1949), at p. 47, cites the Komsomol membership then as 9,676,000. This represents a gain of nearly 400,000 since the Eleventh Congress. Most recent accounts assume a membership of around 10,000,000.

II. TRAINING THE KOMSOMOLS

The process starts in the kindergarten, where children's play, singing, and story-telling are used, as a recent Soviet text book put it, "to instill love of the Soviet fatherland, its people, its leaders, and the Soviet Army. . . ."[30] The child is first enrolled in the "Little Octobrists," where his education in civic responsibilities begins. At the age of nine, he becomes eligible for membership in the "Young Pioneers," where his political education begins to assume more significant proportions.[31] Membership in the Young Pioneers, which now runs between thirteen and fourteen million, is virtually universal in the eligible age group, nine to fifteen. Indeed, the drive to affiliate is so great in the early impressionable years that the threat of exclusion is frequently a sufficient sanction to discipline the most unruly. Entrance into the Pioneers is the occasion for an impressive initiation ceremony replete with symbolism and emblems calculated to appeal to the very young. The celebration is attended by all the Pioneers of the school, their leaders, teachers, the school director and honored guests. As described in a recent account,[32] the assembly hall is decorated with portraits of Lenin and Stalin. The Pioneers march into the hall in quasi-military formation. One of the honored guests, an Old Bolshevik, presents each initiate, arrayed in his new uniform, with his red kerchief, his Pioneer badge, and his membership card. As the presentation is made, the symbolism of kerchief and badge is explained. The three corners of the triangularly-folded kerchief stand for Party, Komsomol, and Pioneer, pillars of the Soviet state. The badge is decorated with a red flag on which are the hammer and sickle and a campfire of five logs burning with three flames. The five logs represent the continents of the earth; the three flames symbolize the Third International with its promise of the future world revolution. The new recruits are greeted with the slogan, "To battle for Lenin and Stalin—be ready!", and they reply in the slogan emblazoned on the Pioneer badge, "Always ready!", while rendering the Pioneer salute. The ceremony is concluded with speech-making, recitations, and songs designed to impress the initiates with their new estate.

Once enrolled in the Pioneers, the new member becomes part of a "link" of eight to twelve youngsters who elect their own leader. The "links" are united in a "brigade" with approximately forty members in the same or adjoining classes. Each brigade chooses its "council" of five to represent it and functions under a Komsomol leader who is designated to supervise and direct brigade activities. These activities vary with the age level of the Pioneers. In the younger classes, political inspiration at meetings largely takes the form of tales of the childhood of Lenin or Stalin or stories of heroism on the part of young

---

[30] E. N. Medynskii, *Narodnoe Obrazovanie i SSSR* (Moscow, 1947), p. 32.

[31] For recent descriptions of Pioneer activities, see *Kommunisticheskoe Vospitanie v Sovetskoi Shkole* [Communist Education in the Soviet School] (Moscow, 1950), pp. 313–336.

[32] *Ibid.*, pp. 322 ff.

Pioneers in the war against the Nazis. With older children, political instruction becomes more pointed. The biographies of Lenin and Stalin are studied more carefully with emphasis on their revolutionary activities. The heroic exploits of the Soviet army are celebrated; there are lectures on the Constitution, and national and international events are reviewed from the Party standpoint.

Political instruction in the narrow sense, however, is only one part of the Pioneer program. There are also a variety of organized activities such as excursions for nature study, to museums, and points of historical interest, athletic competitions, literary, dramatic, and musical evenings, and opportunities to pursue hobbies at school or at the so-called Houses of Pioneers, which are set aside as centers of Pioneer extra-curricular programs. There is the requirement to engage in socially useful work, which may embrace such diverse activities as helping to edit a wall newspaper for Pioneers, gathering scrap, working in the school garden or on a neighboring Kolkhoz, or even helping combat "religious prejudices" in the home. The tendency of these extra-curricular activities to compete with and even interfere with school programs has led to periodic protests by Soviet school authorities against overburdening the child with outside activities. The present tendency is to integrate Pioneer activities as closely as possible with the school, to emphasize classroom obligations as the first responsibility of the Pioneer, and to arrange the Pioneer program so that it supports, rather than comes into conflict with, the school curriculum.

The Pioneers are designed to take care of children between the ages of nine and fifteen. At the age of fourteen, however, the child becomes eligible for membership in the Komsomols, provided, of course, that he can satisfy the conditions for admission.[33] These conditions include recommendation by one member of the Communist Party or two Komsomols who have themselves been members of the organization for at least a year. Recommendation by the council of a Pioneer brigade counts as the equivalent of one recommendation by a Komsomol member. The candidate for admission must be approved both by the local Komsomol organization which he seeks to enter and by the district or town committee which exercises jurisdiction over that local organization.

Enrollment in the Komsomols is thus a much more selective process than membership in the Pioneers. Where the Pioneers operate as a virtually universal organization for all children in the eligible age group, not more than half of the students in the upper three classes of the ten-year school ordinarily join the Komsomols, and only about a quarter of those in the eligible age group (fourteen to twenty-six) are presently Komsomol members. The Komsomol is the reservoir from which Party members will be recruited; and in the eyes of the Party leadership at least, this is the period of tutelage when qualifications can be sifted and political ardor tested. The Rules of the organization require each member to study Marxism-Leninism, to engage in constant efforts to raise his political literacy, to explain the political line of the Party to the broad masses of youth, to fulfill the decisions of the Party and Komsomol organizations, to participate actively in the political life of the country, to provide an example of socialist attitudes toward work and study, to protect socialist property, to struggle decisively against all breaches of socialist legality and order, to demonstrate political vigilance by guarding war and state secrets, to master the cultural, scientific and technical knowledge which will enable him to perfect his qualifications, to study military affairs, to be always ready to give all his strength and if necessary his life for the defense of his Socialist Fatherland, to seek to stamp out drunkenness, hooliganism, the remains of backward religious prejudices, and uncomradely attitudes toward women, to participate actively in the work of his Komsomol organization, to attend all meetings, and to fulfill all decisions swiftly and accurately.[34]

---

[33] See the revised rules adopted at the Eleventh Congress of the Komsomol, April 6, 1949. They are reprinted in full in *Molodoi Bol'shevik*, No. 9, pp. 19–24 (May, 1949).

This is, of course, the proclamation of a Party ideal rather than a realistic description of the state of mind of a rank-and-file Komsomol initiate. There are Komsomol activists who seek to approximate the ideal-type, and who demonstrate all the hallmarks of ideological devotion and dedication. But, if the testimony of ex-Komsomol defectors is to be credited, this group constitutes a small minority, perhaps no greater than ten to twenty per cent of the membership. The motives which inspire the others to affiliate tend to be both more earthy and more complex. For many careerism apparently plays a major rôle. The knowledge that Komsomol and Party membership opens the way to power and preferment in the Soviet system operates as a strong inducement for the ambitious to affiliate, even when ideological fervor burns low. Sometimes the attraction of membership is predominantly social; the young women among the Soviet non-returners tended especially to stress the appeal of Komsomol-sponsored discussion clubs, excursions, dances, and musicales as contributing greatly to the attractions of membership. A number of ex-Komsomolites emphasized the pride which they felt in being singled out as of leadership calibre. Many who could not be counted among the more zealous activists reported that they had been so molded and formed by previous indoctrination that they simply accepted Komsomol membership as a natural expression of the rôle which they were expected to play in life. This attitude of uncritical acknowledgment of the existing structure of authority appears to be widespread and pervasive, at least until it is challenged by unhappy experiences in Soviet society, exposure to the West, or other sources of disenchantment.

III. ORGANIZATION OF THE KOMSOMOLS

The organization of the Komsomols is closely modeled on the hierarchical pattern of its big brother, the Party.[35] At the bottom of the pyramid are the primary organizations in factories, collective farms, state farms, educational and other state institutions. Each primary organization must have at least three members and is established with the consent of the district or town committee which exercises supervision over it. Where the primary organization consists of more than a hundred members, it may be broken down into subgroups in shops of a factory, different faculties of a university, etc. Where the group has less than ten members, a secretary is selected to provide leadership. In larger groups a committee or bureau as well as a secretary serves as the directing nucleus. Both perform their Komsomol duties in addition to their regular employment. Full-time Komsomol secretaries are ordinarily assigned by the central apparatus only to important enterprises or institutions where there is a substantial membership and a program of work requiring the exclusive attention of a Komsomol functionary. In most cases the primary Komsomol organizations operate under the control of the district or town Komsomol committees and their secretaries; but in the armed forces and in institutions where special political sections have been established, the line of responsibility is directly to the head of the political section, or his assistant in charge of Komsomol activity. In units of the armed forces, the Komsomol organizations function under the immediate direction of the Assistant Commander for Political Affairs and in close collaboration with the Party organization in the unit. The chain of command in such cases runs through the armed forces hierarchy, rather than to the apparatus of district and regional Komsomol committees.

---

[34] *Ibid.*, pp. 19–20.

[35] *Ibid.*, pp. 20–24.

At the district or town level, supervisory power is concentrated in a committee which in turn elects a bureau and a number of secretaries. But, if the testimony of ex-Komsomols is to be credited, "election" is a euphemism so far as the secretaries are concerned. They report that the secretaries are full-time Komsomol functionaries who are assigned by higher echelons in the organization and are automatically confirmed in their responsibilities by the committees. The Rules of the Komsomol require that district or town secretaries be members or candidates for membership in the Party with two years of experience in Komsomol work. The key figure in the organization is the first secretary. The importance of the rôle is attested by the fact that, in 1949, 99 per cent of all first secretaries in towns and 95.2 per cent of all first secretaries in districts were Party members.[36] The first secretary exercises a general supervisory responsibility over all Komsomol work; more specific responsibilities such as the direction of Pioneers, activities in schools, factories, or collective farms, work with young women, physical culture and sports, military training, and organization and agitation are assigned to the other secretaries depending on their character and availability.

The next higher levels in the Komsomol hierarchy are the regional and republic organizations. Here the basic pattern of organization is essentially the same as below. There is the regional or central committee of the republic, a smaller bureau within it, and a full complement of secretaries with assigned responsibilities for different aspects of Komsomol activity. At this level secretaries are required to be Party members with at least three years of experience in the Komsomol. Operating under them are substantial staffs of full-time Komsomol functionaries with specific responsibilities running the gamut of the organization's activities.

The central administrative organization of the Komsomol consisted in 1949 of a Central Committee of 103 members and 47 candidates, a control commission of 31 members, a bureau of 11 members, five secretaries, and a large secretariat, all of whom operate under the general direction of the First Secretary, N. A. Mikhailov.[37] Theoretically, the highest organ in the Komsomol is the All-Union Congress, which, according to the Rules, is required to meet at least once every three years. Until the Tenth Congress in 1936, meetings were held with reasonable regularity. There then ensued a thirteen year break before the Eleventh Congress was finally assembled in 1949. The report of the Mandate Commission of the Eleventh Congress is revealing.[38] Of the 1362 delegates who participated, 548 were leading full-time Komsomol functionaries and only 126 were classified as workers and 126 as collective farmers; 953 delegates were either Party members or candidates; 669 were twenty-six years old or older, ordinarily the age when Komsomol membership expires; 195 of these were over thirty. While forty-four nationalities were supposed to be represented in the Congress, 850 delegates, or over 60 per cent, were Great Russians. The impression which is unmistakably conveyed is of an assembly dominated by a Party and Komsomol apparatus made up substantially of Party members masquerading as over-aged Komsomols and with a marked Great Russian coloration. As in the case of the Party, the Congress has become a rally of functionaries called together to ratify and applaud the decisions of the leadership.

---

[36] See the report of the Central Committee delivered to the Eleventh Congress by First Secretary N. A. Mikhailov, *ibid.*, No. 8, p. 36 (April, 1949).

According to the Rules, the Central Committee exercises policy direction between Congresses while the Control Commission watches over budget, personnel, and the execution of decisions. While both these bodies meet with reasonable frequency and in fact play a much more important rôle than the Congress, they in turn operate under the direction of the First Secretary, N. A. Mikhailov, whose position as a member both of the Central Committee of the Party and of the Orgbureau gives him a status only below that of the Politbureau circle. It can be assumed that the top Party leadership has entrusted Mikhailov with the supervision of Komsomol affairs and that it is through him Party directives on Komsomol matters are transmitted and executed.

IV. ACTIVITIES OF THE KOMSOMOLS

While the responsibilities of the Komsomol organization embrace a wide range of diversified activities, the emphasis, in contrast with the Pioneers, is much more heavily on the political. These activities include:

1. Political instruction of Komsomol members.
2. Political instruction and leadership supplied by the Komsomols to the Pioneers, to non-affiliated youth, and to other groups.
3. Military and para-military training and physical culture and sports.
4. Leadership and assistance in carrying out governmental and Party programs.
5. Social and cultural activity.

The political indoctrination of all Komsomol members is a central concern of the Party. As has already been observed, it begins seriously with the Pioneers and increases in scope and intensity as children grow older. No aspect of the school curriculum is without some political coloration, though in the upper grades instruction in history and the Soviet Constitution is used as the primary vehicle for instilling Party consciousness and loyalty. Ordinarily instructors in these areas are Party members or candidates. In the advanced institutes and universities, there will also be extensive programs of instruction in Ist-Mat (Historical Materialism) or Dia-Mat (Dialectical Materialism) as well as in allied political subjects. Such instruction is invariably entrusted to Party members. In addition, the Komsomol organization carries on an extensive program of political education under its own auspices. According to Mikhailov's report at the Eleventh Congress, in 1949 there were 237,125 political circles and schools in which more than four million Komsomols were engaged in studying aspects of Marxism-Leninism.[39] In addition, he asserted that there were many engaged in self-study programs devoted to the official history of the Party, the works of Lenin and Stalin, and other political topics. This activity was directed by a corps of more than 200,000 propagandists, of whom more than 45 per cent were Party members. In the same report he indicated that *Komsomolskaya Pravda*, the central Komsomol journal, had a circulation of 700,000 and that *Pionerskaya Pravda*, the central Pioneer journal, was issued in editions of 1,000,000 copies. In addition, he cited the existence of thirty-seven Komsomol and seventeen Pioneer newspapers as well as eight Komsomol and fifteen children's magazines with a total circulation of around four million.[40]

---

[37] The membership of these bodies is listed in *ibid.*, No. 9, pp. 25–26 (May, 1949).

[38] *Ibid.*, No. 8, pp. 66–72 (April, 1949).

The members of the Komsomols are not only indoctrinated; they are also required to indoctrinate. The Komsomols have a special responsibility for the Young Pioneers. Each Pioneer brigade has its assigned Komsomol leader, who not only supervises play and social activity, but is supposed to instill Communist consciousness in his charges. Komsomol activists are also assigned to Pioneer summer camps to undertake similar responsibilities; they are called upon to take the leadership in school assemblies in delivering reports and fiery speeches on current political themes; they serve as agitators to explain Party policy to the "backward" masses; they take an active speech-making rôle in pre-election campaigns, loan drives, and collections for a variety of revolutionary causes.

Komsomols are also expected to provide leadership in the area of physical culture, sports, and military training. The first obligation of the Komsomol, according to a recent Soviet text, is to prepare himself for service in the Soviet Army. "The Komsomol member must be a leading physical culturist."[41] Preparatory to their own military service, they are required to take an active rôle in the para-military "voluntary" societies which serve the various branches of the armed forces, Dosarm (army), Dosav (air) and Dosflot (navy).[42] In this capacity they engage in shooting practice, air raid drills, first aid, long marches, parachute and glider training, and political meetings at which the necessity for military preparedness is constantly reiterated.

---

[39] *Ibid.*, p. 27. [40] *Ibid.*, p. 29.

[41] *Young Communists in the USSR*, translated by Virginia Rhine (Washington, 1950), p. 19.

[42] For descriptions of Komsomol relationships to Dosarm and Dosflot, see Major-General V. Golovkin, "Komsomol and Dosarm," *Molodoi Bol'shevik*, No. 22, pp. 31–35 (November, 1949), and Rear Admiral I. Golubev-Monatkin, "Komsomol and Dosflot," *ibid.*, No. 14, pp. 35–39 (July, 1950).

The Komsomolite is also expected to serve as a model and example for the youth of the country by assisting his Party and government in every way. He is supposed to volunteer for the most strenuous and disagreeable tasks, to help with the harvest, to enlist for the new construction job, to work in the mines, or to go wherever his organization sends him. Whether he be in the factory or the school, he is expected to be an outstanding worker, a paragon of discipline, a stimulus to his associates, and a constant help to his superiors in carrying out their responsibilities. He is adjured to be constantly on guard against "enemies of the people"; ex-Komsomolites testify that the more zealous members of the organization are frequently enrolled by the Secret Police as "seksots," or informers, to report on their comrades and associates both inside and outside the Komsomol.

Finally, there is the area of social-cultural activity where the Komsomolite is expected to cultivate many-sided interests in order to make himself a "whole" man. This is the area which the less fervid members find most attractive, because of its relative removal from the political realm. The literary, dramatic, dancing, and singing groups which the Komsomol sponsors provide some relief from the incessant and concentrated political bombardment to which youth is exposed, but even these forms of social-cultural activity are far from being apolitical. Komsomolites participating in a series of evenings devoted to Pushkin discuss papers on such themes as "Pushkin and the Decembrists," "Pushkin on Capitalism," "Pushkin-Patriot," "Pushkin and the Present," and "Pushkin's Criticism of America."[43] The dramatic groups read and produce plays from the contemporary Soviet repertoire which are heavily saturated with doctrinal content. Even the dancing and singing are partly organized around political themes. In the Soviet state there is no real escape from the long arm of ideological control.

V. PROBLEMS OF LOYALTY AND DISAFFECTION

What manner of man does the Komsomol seek to create and what values does the top Party leadership seek to implant in the minds of youth? A recent Soviet monograph entitled *Young Communists in the U.S.S.R.*, which describes the demands made on Komsomols, furnishes a vivid and even frightening insight into Party goals and purposes. "The most important task of the Komsomol organization," says the monograph, "is to maintain in all the youth Soviet patriotism, Soviet national pride, the aspiration to make our Socialist state ever stronger."[44] . . . "Whatever the Komsomol may do, with whatever works or studies he may occupy himself, he must always be prepared to enter the ranks of the Soviet Army at the first call of the Party and the Soviet government. . . ."[45] In civil, as well as military life, he must provide a shining example of self-sacrifice and discipline. The Komsomol is told that he lives in the greatest and most progressive country in the world, and that what gives his country its strength is the leadership of the Communist Party guided by the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin. "To study Marxism-Leninism is the duty and obligation of every Komsomol member."[46] Every Komsomol is obligated to carry out the policies of the Bolshevik Party steadily and consistently. "All his life must be subordinated to the great aim—the struggle for Communism."[47] . . . "It is completely correct to say that personal existence is politics."[48] . . . "The hero of our time, of our country, is the person who contributes to the welfare of the Soviet Socialist Motherland by his labor and exploits, and who is unselfishly devoted to the work of the Party of Lenin and Stalin, the work of Communism. He is a man who does not fear any enemies or difficulties; he is the builder of the new society."[49]

---

[43] See D. G. Popov, "The Work of Komsomol Organizations in the School," in *Kommunisticheskoe Vospitanie v Sovetskoi Shkole* (Moscow, 1950), p. 289.

[44] *Young Communists in the USSR*, p. 7.

This image of the ideal Komsomolite with its stress on the virtues of disciplined obedience to Party dictates represents the ultimate value which the Party leadership seeks to inculcate. But the energies of youth, even under dictatorship, elude such tight constraints. In the words of the anonymous author of *Young Communists in the U.S.S.R.*, ". . . the survivals of the old way of life have still not been finally overcome. . . . The baneful influence of bourgeois ideology sometimes penetrates into the midst of our youth."[50]

It is no easy matter to come to any reliable judgments on the state of mind of Soviet young people, or more particularly, to appraise the extent of disaffection among them. In the absence of free access to the Soviet Union itself, judgments must necessarily be reached on the basis of self-criticism appearing in the Soviet press and on interviews with ex-Komsomolites and others in the Soviet emigration who have had extensive contacts with Soviet youth. The data derived from these sources do not lend themselves to sweeping conclusions or exact statistical formulations; at best when cautiously utilized, they point to the existence of certain stresses and weaknesses in the ability of the régime to command the loyalty of youth.

It is possible on the basis of interviews with defectors to identify situations which corrode faith and even categories of youth whose loyalty to the régime can be considered dubious. Children of parents who have been persecuted by the Soviet régime constitute such a group, though not all of them can be automatically classified as disloyal. They include such diverse elements as the descendants of the "former people" of Czarist times, the offspring of the Kulaks who were dispossessed in the course of collectivization, and the relatives of victims of the purges and of inmates of the forced labor camps. Many of these groups experienced persecution as children, which they never altogether forgot or forgave. Because they are regarded as suspect by the MGB, their career expectancies are limited, and such children tend to become covert opponents of the régime as they grow up. Even those who manage somehow to transcend the handicaps of their social background, to enter the Komsomol, and embark on promising careers in Soviet society, live with the constant fear that their pasts will rise up to plague them. Public affirmations of loyalty conceal inner torments and tensions.

---

[45] *Ibid.*, p. 16.
[46] *Ibid.*, p. 51.
[47] *Ibid.*, p. 77.
[48] *Ibid.*, p. 79.
[49] *Ibid.*, p. 82.
[50] *Ibid.*, p. 76.

The peasant youth in the villages and collective farms appears to be another category in which Communist indoctrination is at a relatively low level. Komsomol enrollment in rural areas has always been significantly lower than in the urban industrial centers; and despite constant efforts to improve the ratio, the villages remain a weak link in the chain.[51] It is in the countryside that cross-loyalties exert their most significant influence. The persistence among the older generation of antipathy to collectivization, memories of past suffering and present hardships, and strongly-ingrained religious attitudes leave an impress on the younger generation which Communist propaganda in the schools cannot wholly counteract or eradicate. Indeed, the relative weakness of the Communist apparatus in the villages contributes to the strength of family influences. As the youth are drained away from the villages for military service or industrial work, they are, of course, removed from family pressures and are subjected to more intensive Communist indoctrination. In the process, new converts are won for Komsomol and Party, but how genuinely and profoundly fundamental attitudes shift is by no means clear.

Other youth elements whose loyalty can be regarded as, at least, dubious are those who were repatriated from Germany and Austria at the end of the War, or who saw service in the West as soldiers of the Red Army in the advance through Eastern and Central Europe, or who had duty later with the occupation forces or administration. The exposure to the West, with its opportunity to see how ordinary workers and farmers live abroad and to compare their relatively advanced standards with the low standards still prevailing in the Soviet Union, offered such a blatant contradiction to official Party propaganda about the West as inevitably to plant doubts and generate discontent. One of the problems of the Soviet régime in the post-war years has been to isolate and neutralize these centers of infection. The repatriates who have since escaped from the Soviet Union report that they were treated by the Soviet secret police with the utmost suspicion, that many of their compatriots were arrested and presumably shipped to forced labor camps, and that relatively few were permitted to resettle in their former homes. The demobilized soldiers and officers who related their discoveries in the West to friends and neighbors at the end of the War are also reported to have encountered serious difficulties. The sharp drop in Komsomol enrollment after 1945 may be interpreted, in part at least, as an index of attrition of loyalties among returning veterans. Similar problems, according to defector reports, have arisen in connection with the morale of occupation forces, although these reports also indicate that the régime in recent years has made the most strenuous efforts to screen troops assigned to occupation duty for political reliability, to subject them to the most intensive indoctrination, and to limit their contacts with local populations to an indispensable minimum. Even these efforts have not been altogether effective in stopping defection, nor can they prevent the gathering of impressions whose cumulative effect may be ideologically corrosive.

---

[51] A very recent illustration is furnished by a report on the amalgamation of collective farms in the Zagorskii district of the Moscow region appearing in *Molodoi Bol'shevik,* No. 17, pp. 56–60 (September, 1950). Prior to the amalgamation in June, 1950, Komsomol organizations existed in only 43 collective farms out of a total of 141. After the amalgamation, these Komsomol units were organized in 25 out of 32 collective farms. However, of the 141 new work brigades, only 30 contained Komsomol groups. It needs to be remembered that the Moscow region counts as one of the most advanced.

Disaffection may also be a product of individual, as well as group experiences. The youth who finds himself consigned to the State Labor Reserves when his own ambition is to go on to a higher education, the student who is forced to give up his studies because he cannot afford to pay the necessary tuition fees, the university or institute graduate who is dissatisfied with the assignment which he receives on completion of his course of study, the young worker who cannot adjust to the tight labor discipline of the Soviet system with its severe penalties for absence and tardiness, the independent-minded young intellectual who is forced to suppress his views lest it cost him his career, the victims of denunciations and purges, the politically "backward" young people who find the constantly reiterated propaganda a bore and long for "bourgeois" comforts and gayety—these are only samples of Soviet life-situations which breed frustration and disillusionment, even when they are hidden under a surface show of compliance and affirmation.

Some corroboration of the existence of such attitudes among Soviet youth is available in official Soviet sources. The monograph *Young Communists in the U.S.S.R.* is loud in its denunciations of "bourgeois survivals among some of the youth."[52] . . . "It is necessary to unmask, to ridicule commonplace bourgeois tastes . . . unworthy of Soviet youth, by some youths and girls of rotten bourgeois 'culture'."[53] . . . "Such backward people are willing to declare: 'One's personal life is nobody's business; how I live concerns only myself and no one else'. . . . Such a point of view is profoundly incorrect and pernicious."[54] . . . "The remnants of the past find their expression also in various superstitions and prejudices which permeate youth."[55] These religious inclinations are referred to as a "delusion which poisons the hearts of young people . . ." and which must be combatted by "thoughtful and patient anti-religious propaganda."[56] The Komsomol is called upon to fight "against servility before the bourgeois West, and rotten apoliticalness."[57] Mikhailov, in his keynote speech to the Eleventh Congress of the Komsomol, was particularly critical of what he called the formalism of political work in the universities, and he sharply attacked the apolitical and cosmopolitan influences of "several" Leningrad universities.[58] He picked out for special censure the tendency of some university graduates to try to evade assignments to areas far from the large cities and to wangle office rather than production assignments. At the December, 1949, Plenum of the Central Committee, which followed the Eleventh Congress, considerable concern was expressed over the failure of several leading Komsomol organizations to recruit new members and the tendency of some of the existing membership to lose interest and drop out. The lag in rural recruitment was singled out as particularly unsatisfactory.[59]

---

[52] *Op. cit.*, p. 77. [53] *Ibid.* [54] *Ibid.*
[55] *Ibid.*, p. 79. [56] *Ibid.*, p. 80. [57] *Ibid.*, p. 11.
[58] *Molodoi Bol'shevik*, No. 8, p. 25 (April, 1949).

Both official reports and the information supplied by ex-Soviet citizens indicate diversity in the attitude of different sectors of Soviet youth toward the régime. But they by no means agree on the quantitative distribution of these attitudes. In the official view, Soviet youth is overwhelmingly devoted and loyal, and it is only a small minority who are backward, indifferent, or hostile. The impression derived from interviews with ex-Komsomolites among the Soviet defectors is quite different. They agree that there is a firm nucleus of Komsomol activists who are genuine ideological converts. This group rarely loses faith and indeed may even become more fanatical as it grows older. It is from this element that the Party and the secret police recruit their most devoted cadres. Around this nucleus, in the view of defector informants, there is a much larger circle of youth who join the Komsomol and even go on into the Party, inspired by motivations which may be described as largely careerist in character. Overtly, they are pro-régime; they take an active part in political life, and go through the motions of conformity in order to make their way in Soviet society. But they lack the fanaticism of the first group. Their inner "real" political affiliation may embrace such widely different attitudes as passive acceptance of the régime, apathy, cynicism, or even bitterly suppressed resentment of the life-situations in which they find themselves. Such apt terms as "the outer cover" (vneshnaya obolochka) and "the reddish scale" (krasnovataya okalina) have been coined to describe these careerists, with the implication that you don't have to scratch very deep to find the real animal. Yet so far as surface behavior goes, they give every evidence of being not only loyal, but active Soviet citizens.

Around this group there stretches the great outer circle of Soviet young people who never affiliate with the Komsomol and, who, in purely numerical terms, constitute the mass of Soviet youth. This circle includes such diverse elements as the bulk of young collective farmers, the majority of young workers in industry, and a substantial number of young intellectuals who evade membership even when the opportunity to affiliate is presented, sometimes at considerable risks to their future careers. It is not easy to generalize on the political attitudes of the non-Komsomolites, but, if defector evidence is to be trusted, they harbor the powers of inertia and apathy in Soviet society; they include much latent hostility to the régime; and they represent that sector in Soviet society where political indoctrination meets its most passive response.

The testimony of defectors, both young and old, is virtually unanimous in emphasizing a decline in the ideological élan of youth, as compared with the idealism of Civil War days or the great outpouring of energy and dedication which accompanied the first phase of the Five Year Plans. As Soviet society has crystallized into a militarized, authoritarian, and hierarchical pattern, the apocalyptic vision of the free, classless Communist utopia becomes an increasingly tarnished dream, with little power to stir the imagination or devotion of any except the very immature. There are still great goals to be attained, but they are essentially practical goals, the construction of new heavy industry, the building up of military strength, and the expansion of Soviet power. The problem of the régime is to harness the energies of youth to achieve these goals. In attempting to solve this problem, ideology is only one of many weapons, and not necessarily the most important.

---

[59] See Resolutions of the Second Plenum of the Komsomol Central Committee on the Work of the Komosomol Organizations in the Sverdlovsk Region and the Stalingrad Tractor Factory, *Molodoi Bol'shevik*, No. 1, pp. 33–44 (January, 1950).

Perhaps the most potent is the power of the régime to control the career expectancies of youth, to reward achievement which fits in with the goals of the leadership, and to punish deviant conduct with the most severe penalties. The system of incentives offers the highest prizes to those who manage to incorporate themselves into the leadership stratum of Party, secret police, army, and administration; it provides attractive emoluments for the intellectuals who are willing to sing the tunes of the régime; and it gives special bonuses to the managers, the engineers, and the shock brigadiers who distinguish themselves in production. It buttresses financial awards with a system of honorifics designed to be particularly attractive to the less sophisticated.

The obverse side of the medal is the use of fear and terror as political weapons. For the workers who lag in production there is the discipline of a wage system that consigns the laggard to the lowest minimum of subsistence. For all who deviate from the straight and narrow path of conformity to the leadership's demands, there is the omnipresent danger of arrest by the secret police and confinement in a forced labor camp. Whip and carrot combine to extirpate the slightest overt demonstration of opposition to the régime.

At the same time the régime is shrewd enough to understand that this system of rewards and punishments must be given ideological justification if it is to possess the minds as well as enlist the energies of youth. The appeal of the ultimate utopian goal is not wholly abandoned, even if it be less stressed and less effective. But blame for the postponement of its realization is placed on the continued existence of the cunning capitalist enemy without; the Soviet Union must be an armed fortress and live in a state of siege if it is to survive and triumph over the capitalist encirclement. At the same time Communist victories in Europe and Asia are used to support the promise that the ultimate world triumph will not be too long delayed, that the voice of the future is the voice of Communism, and that present sacrifices prepare the way for the Promised Land of plenty which will come afterwards.

Meanwhile, youth is told, it must work, obey, and learn to fight. The main enemy this time is the United States instead of the Nazis. Every propaganda organ builds an image of the aggressive American imperialist as a barbaric replica of the Nazi out to dominate the world. The objective of this campaign is to channel all the genuine hatred which the Nazis provoked and all the frustration and aggression which accumulate within Soviet society against this new external enemy symbol of America. Soviet youth are warned that they must be prepared to make the sternest sacrifices to defend their homes and families, and preserve their Soviet fatherland, as a symbol of liberation and hope for the oppressed masses in capitalist-dominated countries.

This in its basic outlines is the indoctrination to which Soviet youth is being currently exposed. It is reiterated in every mass media, in oral agitation, and in every nook and cranny of the Soviet educational and propaganda system. Its power to persuade those who caught a glimpse of the West may be questioned. There is abundant proof, both in the reports of defectors and in the series of post-war ideological purges and campaigns which have been directed against cosmopolitanism and adulation of the West, that it meets with some resistance in intellectual and, perhaps, other circles. But for the oncoming generation of youth, now almost totally sealed off from the West, insulated against outside contacts, and subject to exclusive manipulation by the Party leadership, the strength of the current appeal to the youth who have come of age since World War II should not be underestimated. In the years since the Revolution, the attrition of loyalties in the middle-aged and the old has been counter-balanced by the capacity of the régime, through the Komsomol and the Young Pioneers, to indoctrinate a part of each new generation of youth with its own values. Whether or not this indoctrination survives the trials and tribulations of later life, it has played and may continue to play a rôle of crucial significance in replenishing the life energies of the régime.

The apparent strength of totalitarianism is its capacity to mobilize the loyalties of impressionable youth. The weaknesses of the totalitarian régime only become fully evident after its downfall. The great paradox of totalitarianism is its inability to fulfill its own totalitarian aspirations. The monolithic façade conceals tensions and grievances from which no Soviet generation is free. The fate of the Western world may well depend on the development of successful measures to undermine the indoctrination to which Soviet youth is exposed and to exploit the cleavages with which Soviet society is permeated.

THE OPERATION OF THE LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946

GEORGE B. GALLOWAY
Library of Congress

In this article I will attempt to review the operation of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 in terms of its own objectives. Criticisms of the limitations and shortcomings of the Act have been discussed elsewhere.[1] In describing the reformed system and the way it works, it is no part of my intention to impute praise or blame to any of the actors in the drama. As a member of the staff of the Library of Congress, I view the legislative scene with as much nonaxiological detachment as an anthropologist would describe the customs and mores of primitive tribes on some tropical island. Whether or not the system is an authentic expression of democratic government, I am not at liberty to say.

I. OBJECTIVES OF THE ACT

As conceived and formulated by its authors and as enacted by Congress, with some significant omissions,[2] the Act (as I shall henceforth refer to the Legislative Reorganization Act, for the sake of brevity) had the following objectives:

1. To streamline and simplify congressional committee structure.
2. To eliminate the use of special or select committees.
3. To clarify committee duties and reduce jurisdictional disputes.
4. To regularize and publicize committee procedures.
5. To improve congressional staff aids.
6. To reduce the work load on Congress.
7. To strengthen legislative oversight of administration.
8. To reinforce the power of the purse.
9. To regulate lobbying.
10. To increase the compensation of Members of Congress and provide them retirement pay.

II. COMMITTEE STRUCTURE

Modernization of the standing committee system was the first objective of the Act and the keystone in the arch of congressional reform. By dropping minor, inactive committees and by merging those with related functions, the Act reduced the total number of standing committees from 33 to 15 in the Senate, and from 48 to 19 in the House of Representatives. This reform has now survived four years and two Congresses—one controlled by the Republicans and one controlled by the Democrats—without change or successful challenge. On February 7, 1949, Senators Holland and Wherry offered a resolution (S. Res. 58) to create a standing Senate Committee on Small Business, which was favorably reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration on June 29, 1949. But after extended debate the Senate, by a two-to-one vote, decided instead to create a select committee to investigate small business problems.[3] Thus, the reorganized standing committee system seems to have won congressional acceptance for the time being.

---

[1] See Joseph P. Harris, "The Reorganization of Congress," *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 6, pp. 267–282 (Summer, 1946); Charles W. Shull, "The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946," *Temple Law Quarterly*, Vol. 20, pp. 375–395 (January, 1947); Harold Zink, "Reorganization Efforts in Congress," *Parliamentary Affairs*, Vol. 3, pp. 94–103 (Winter, 1949); A. S. Mike Monroney, "The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946: A First Appraisal," in *The Strengthening of American Political Institutions* (Ithaca, 1949). See also Philip S. Broughton, "Congress is Far From Reorganized," *New York Times Magazine*, May 18, 1947; Robert C. Hartnett, "Has Congress Been Modernized?" *America*, Vol. 77, pp. 429–431 (July 19, 1947); Estes Kefauver, "Did We Modernize Congress?" *National Municipal Review*, Vol. 36, pp. 552–557 (November, 1947).

[2] Cf. George B. Galloway, *Congress at the Crossroads* (New York, 1946), pp. 342–344.

Under the old system the standing committees of the House ranged in size from 2 to 42 members, averaging 19 members each. Under the Act, 15 of the 19 House committees had 25 or 27 members each in 1950 and the average size was 25 members. Rules, with 12 members, and Un-American Activities, with 9 members, remain unchanged in size. Appropriations now has 50 members, compared with 42 before, and Armed Services has 35, compared with a combined membership of 61 on the old Military and Naval Affairs committees.

Before the Act, the standing committees of the Senate ranged in size from 3 to 25 members and averaged 15 members each. Under the Act all of the Senate standing committees have 13 members, except Appropriations with 21, as compared with 25 before.

Before the Act, every Senator was entitled to serve on three major committees and two minor committees. Some individuals had up to ten committee assignments. There were conflicts in committee meetings, duplications in committee jurisdiction, and inefficient distribution of the legislative work load among committees. Under the Act, no Senator may serve on more than two standing committees, except that majority party Senators may also serve on the District of Columbia and the Expenditures committees; and, with minor exceptions, each House member now serves on only one standing committee, instead of on three to five, as many members did in the past.

The rule limiting minority Senators to membership on only two committees has had the effect, with a change in party control of the Senate, of requiring some Senators serving on the District of Columbia or the Expenditures committee, in addition to two others, to resign from one. The result during the 81st Congress was to deprive these "second-class committees" of the continued service of such experienced members as Senators Aiken and Ferguson, who, being limited to two committees, felt that they owed it to their constituents to elect to serve on two "national committees."

To meet this situation, Senator Taft introduced a resolution (S. Res. 24) on January 10, 1949, proposing to increase the membership of 8 Senate committees from 13 to 15 members each; to permit 8 minority Senators to serve on three standing committees each; and to permit majority Senators to have a third committee assignment upon any one of five specified "minor" committees. Senate Resolution 24 was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, which took no action upon it. In its behalf Senator Taft argued that (a) in many cases a committee of 13 members is too small to handle its work load, and that (b) new Senators are deprived of important committee assignments under the two-committee-assignment rule because older Senators fill up the limited number of seats on the more attractive committees and leave only the "second-class" committees open for the freshman Senators. Opponents argued that to differentiate between the size of the standing committees of the Senate would be to create a system of major and minor committees. They further maintained that the proposed change would break down the two-committee assignment rule, would add to the work load and responsibilities of Senators in unrelated legislative fields and would increase absenteeism in the Senate.[4]

---

[3] *Congressional Record*, 81st Cong., 2nd Sess., pp. 2011–2034 (Feb. 20, 1950). This and subsequent citations are to the pages of the daily edition.

Many of the old standing committees of Congress were minor, inactive committees—"ornamental barnacles on the ship of state," in Alvin Fuller's phrase. Under the new scheme all of the standing committees in both houses are major committees with important duties. Although some Members still refer to the District of Columbia and Expenditure committees as "second-class," this is an inappropriate appellation to apply to the Expenditure committees, which were rejuvenated by the Act and given weighty responsibilities in the machinery of government field.

It is often said, and perhaps widely believed, that the reduction from 81 to 34 in the number of standing committees of Congress, effected by the Act, has been offset by the creation of a rash of subcommittees. The fact is that the number of standing subcommittees has not changed since 1945. In that year Congress had 131 standing subcommittees: 34 in the Senate and 97 in the House.[5] In 1950 there were 131 standing subcommittees: 66 in the Senate and 65 in the House. During the 81st Congress six House committees and four Senate committees had no standing subcommittees at all. Special subcommittees are set up from time to time in both houses to handle individual bills, but their number fluctuates from week to week, making comparisons misleading. The tendency has been, since passage of the Act, for standing subcommittees to replace special subcommittees for individual bills, affording committeemen and their staffs an opportunity to become specialists in correlated fields of legislation.[6] Readers of Burton K. French's article on "Subcommittees of Congress" in this Review back in February, 1915, will recall that they are nothing new in the legislative process.

---

[4] *Ibid.*, 81st Cong., 1st Sess., pp. 131–133 (Jan. 10, 1949).

[5] *Hearings* before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, 79th Cong., 1st Sess., pursuant to H. Con. Res. 18 . . . (Washington, 1945), p. 1039. Hereafter cited as *Hearings* Pursuant to H. Con. Res. 18.

[6] For comments on the operation of subcommittees under the Act, see *Hearings* before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, U. S. Senate, 80th Cong., 2nd sess., on Evaluation of Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (Washington, 1948), pp. 57, 62, 63, 81, 118, 125, 199. Hereafter cited as *Hearings* on Evaluation of the Legislative Reorganization Act.

Some Congressmen are critical of subcommittees, believing that the entire membership of a committee should handle matters referred to it. Others believe that subdivisions are necessary for the preliminary study of complex matters and are an inescapable feature of the heavy duties now imposed upon the consolidated committees of Congress. The advantages that flow from the division of labor and specialization of function will probably lead most congressional committees to continue to subdivide their work, and to rely on consideration at the full committee stage for coordination and the overall view.

In the form in which it passed the Senate, the Act prohibited special committees.[7] Although this provision was stricken in the House, the spirit of the Act clearly frowns on the creation of special committees. The La Follette-Monroney committee had recommended that the practice of creating special investigating committees be abandoned, on the ground that they lack legislative authority and that the jurisdiction of the new standing committees would be so comprehensively defined, in the reformed rules, as to cover every conceivable subject of legislation. In practice, special committees have not been abandoned, but their number has diminished. In the 79th Congress, before the Act, there were 18 of them: 6 in the House, 9 in the Senate, and 3 joint select committees. In the 80th Congress there were 12 special committees: 6 in the House, 3 in the Senate, and 3 joint ones. Nine special committees were created during the 81st Congress: 6 in the House on small business, lobbying, use of chemicals, campaign expenditures, veterans' education, and roof and skylights; and 3 in the Senate on small business, organized crime, and roof and skylights. They had a combined membership of 65 in 1950.

The Senate has complied more closely than the House with the spirit of the prohibition of special committees. During the 80th Congress it converted its old Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program into a standing subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and its Special Small Business Committee into a standing subcommittee of Banking and Currency. In 1950, on the other hand, the Senate revived its Select Committee on Small Business in response to the persistent efforts of Senators Murray and Wherry, who maintained that small business problems cut across the jurisdiction of many of the standing committees of the Senate and who wanted a forum for their activities in this field. In the House special committees on small business and campaign expenditures are hardy biennials.

Although the Senate version of the Act sought to stimulate joint action between the twin committees of the two houses, this optional provision was struck on the House side; therefore, the Act did not change the joint committee structure of Congress, except to make the long-standing Joint Committees on Printing and the Library in effect joint subcommittees of the two Administration committees of the House and Senate. However, the creation of roughly parallel committee systems in the two chambers, with similar nomenclature and jurisdictions, has tended to facilitate joint action on measures of mutual interest by means of joint hearings and staff collaboration. In recent years several successful joint hearings have been held by twin committees or subcommittees on the reorganization of the government of the District of Columbia, on the budget requirements of the District Government, on foreign economic cooperation and military aid, and on public housing. There has also been a good deal of collaboration between the professional staffs of corresponding committees, which have exchanged information, memoranda, etc., but there are few instances of joint research or cooperation in the preparation of committee reports. Similarly, since the end of World War II the Foreign Affairs committees have occasionally met together in order to hear reports and statements by the Secretary of State, thus saving him the loss of time in a duplicate appearance; but they have then considered and reported their conclusions separately to the two houses.

---

[7] A special or select committee is one which lacks authority to report bills. Its life expires with the Congress during which it was created.

Despite the evident advantages of joint action, it is opposed by some Senators as an impairment of their "appellate jurisdiction," and by some Representatives who are jealous of their own independence and prerogatives. Critics of joint hearings doubt if they save much time and suggest that they raise questions of protocol about such simple things as the seating of Congressmen around the table and precedence in interrogation. Other alleged deterrents to joint action are the different time tables of House and Senate, surviving jurisdictional differences between the parallel committees, and differing perspectives, interests and modes of operation among the Members.

Nevertheless, the number of joint standing committees in Congress has doubled since 1946. In the 79th Congress there were four standing and three select joint committees; in the 80th Congress there were seven standing and four select joint committees; and in the 81st Congress there were eight joint standing committees. The new joint committees on the Economic Report, on Atomic Energy, and on Foreign Economic Cooperation[8] were appointed during the 80th Congress; and the new Joint Committee on Defense Production was established by the Defense Production Act of 1950. The Joint Committee on the Library dates back to 1806 and the Joint Committee on Printing to 1846. The Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation was created in 1926 and the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures (the Byrd committee) in 1941. On February 24, 1950, Senator Humphrey introduced a bill (S. 3116) to abolish the Byrd committee because, he said, it was duplicating the work of the Expenditures committees and was a waste of money. This move stirred up a hornet's nest in the Senate and the Byrd committee is still extant.[9] Eighty-two members of Congress were serving on its joint committees at the end of 1950, exclusive of the insignificant Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers—the so-called "waste basket committee." Both houses are always equally represented on the joint committees, which, therefore, always have an even number of members. The most important and successful of the existing joint congressional committees are those on the Economic Report, which has four active subcommittees,[10] and on Atomic Energy, which alone among the joint committees has legislative authority. Space does not here permit a full evaluation of the work of these joint committees.

---

[8] The Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation was terminated as of Aug. 31, 1950.

[9] *Congressional Record*, 81st Cong., 2nd sess., pp. 2353–2355, 2646–2667, 14863–14865, 15085–15086.

The Act also called for joint action on the part of the revenue and spending committees of both houses in the formulation of a "legislative budget." But this provision, which I shall discuss more fully below, has miscarried.

III. COMMITTEE OPERATION

Consolidation of the standing committees and definition of their duties in the rules—an innovation in the Senate—have reduced but not eliminated jurisdictional disputes over the reference of bills. Although House bills are occasionally re-referred by unanimous consent, open conflicts between committees in the lower chamber have almost disappeared.[11] In the Senate, however, several jurisdictional questions have arisen since 1946. Bills dealing with the complex economic and social problems of the modern world sometimes cut across the defined jurisdictions of two or more standing committees. Intricate legislation designed to solve the problems of an interdependent economy cannot always be reduced to the clear-cut lines of a blueprint of committee duties.

During the 80th Congress, for example, Senate committees argued over the reference of the portal-to-portal bill, the bill proposing unification of the armed forces, automobiles for disabled veterans, an interstate oil compact, and interstate water rights on the Colorado River. Senator Taft questioned the conflicting jurisdiction of the Finance and Labor committees on the subject of veterans' affairs, which he thought ought to be "all in one committee."[12] During the 81st Congress Senate committees quarreled about jurisdiction over small-business problems, the reference of Reorganization Plan No. 8 relating to the Department of Defense and the reference of the Foreign Military Assistance bill. The reference of the last mentioned bill was settled by the unique device of sending it for joint study and report to the combined committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations—an arrangement which worked quite well.[13] Most of the bills implementing the recommendations of the

---

[10] On investment, unemployment, low-income families, and monetary, credit and fiscal policies.

[11] Rep. Thomas A. Jenkins protested reference of the Health Insurance bill (H.R. 4312) to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce instead of to the Ways and Means Committee. *Congressional Record*, 81st Cong., 1st sess., pp. A2661–A2662 (April 28, 1949).

[12] See *Hearings* Pursuant to H. Con. Res. 18, p. 34.

[13] *Congressional Record*, 81st Cong., 1st sess., pp. 10528–10533 (July 28, 1949).

Hoover Commission were referred in both houses to the committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, despite the possibility of conflict implicit in the combination of provisions for both policy and structural changes in some of these measures.

Evidently the language of the Act still leaves room for jurisdictional disputes, as Senator Vandenberg pointed out in his ruling on the reference of the Armed Forces Unification bill.[14] The fact is that jurisdiction over the various aspects of several subject-matter fields is split among many standing committees in both houses of Congress. The committees on Foreign Affairs, Appropriations, Armed Forces, Expenditures, and Foreign Commerce are concerned with various phases of our foreign relations. National defense policies and expenditures are reviewed in piecemeal fashion by several committees in both houses; as Harold Lasswell has shown, "At least two-thirds of the fifteen standing committees of the Senate regularly touch upon some aspect of the security problem."[15] Jurisdiction over our international economic relations is likewise widely scattered. The fiscal machinery of Congress is also splintered and fragmented, and control over major water resource programs is split, in both houses, between the Public Lands and Public Works committees.[16]

Several remedies for these jurisdictional problems have been proposed. They include the reference of bills, in cases of conflict, to the claimant committees concurrently, consecutively, jointly, or to a joint subcommittee of the interested committees, as was done in the case of the House Select Committee on Foreign Aid (the Herter committee) in the 80th Congress.[17] Another suggestion calls for the creation in such fields as national defense and foreign relations of Senate and House "leadership" committees, composed of members drawn from all committees whose jurisdiction covers some fragment of the field.[18] Cross-membership among committees in overlapping areas is another solution. More joint hearings and joint action by committees with common interests, following the example of the Armed Services and Foreign Relations committees on the Military Defense Assistance program, are also advocated. Some favor further use of joint standing committees. In any event, a thorough study of existing committee duties and a redistribution of jurisdictions along more rational lines seem clearly to be necessary.

Under section 133 of the Act, committee procedure has been regularized in regard to periodic meeting days, the keeping of committee records, the reporting of approved measures, the presence of a majority of committeemen as a condition of committee action, and the conduct of hearings. In practice, 13 Senate committees and 9 House committees have fixed regular weekly or bi-weekly meeting days; the other 12 meet upon the call of their chairmen. How complete the records of "all committee action" are, frankly I do not know, but I assume that most committees keep fairly full minutes of their meetings. There may have been some infractions of the rule requiring the presence of a majority for committee reports, because many committees have experienced difficulty in securing the attendance of a majority or even a quorum of their members, both at executive sessions and at open hearings. Under this rule, proxy voting is permissible only after a majority is actually present. It is a common and discouraging experience on Capitol Hill for invited witnesses, who have worked hard and long on the preparation of their testimony, to appear before committees and find only one or a few members present. The requirement that witnesses file written statements of their testimony in advance of hearings is observed by some committees and ignored by others; hearings are sometimes called on too short notice for this action to be possible. Most committees have held open hearings, except the House Committee on Appropriations which has availed itself of the allowed option of holding its hearings in camera. Committee offices, staff personnel and records are now kept separate and distinct from those of committee chairmen.

---

[14] *Ibid.*, 80th Cong., 1st sess., pp. 1465–1467 (Feb. 26, 1947).

[15] Harold D. Lasswell, *National Security and Individual Freedom* (New York, 1950), p. 195.

[16] See Arthur A. Maass, "Congress and Water Resources," AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE REVIEW, Vol. 44, p. 593 (Sept., 1950).

[17] *Hearings* on Evaluation of the Legislative Reorganization Act, pp. 149–150.

[18] Lasswell, *op. cit.*, p. 106.

In accordance with section 134 (b) of the Act, semi-annual reports of all standing and select committee staff personnel and payrolls are made and published in the *Congressional Record*[19] in January and July. Useful information on the staffing of congressional committees is thus made public, although this provision has been interpreted as not applying to joint committees or party policy committees.

In practice, the prohibition against the holding of standing committee meetings while the Senate or House is in session has been so frequently waived, by special leave, especially in the upper house, as to be ineffective in promoting that full attendance on the floor which was its primary purpose. On several occasions in recent years Senators have criticized granting leave to committees to sit while the Senate was in session, but have not been so discourteous as to refuse unanimous consent requests to this end.

Over and beyond the provisions of the Act, a few aspects of committee procedure may be mentioned. There have been noteworthy improvements in the format and content of some committee calendars, of which a conspicuous example was the calendar of the House Judiciary Committee in the 80th Congress—the handiwork of C. Murray Bernhardt, its counsel. Sections 133 and 134 of the Act, on committee procedures and powers, are usually printed in the committee calendars, and in recent years a number of committees have developed the habit of producing comprehensive annual reports of their activities, thanks to their new professional staffs. On February 1, 1950, the Senate adopted an amendment to its Standing Rule XXV which authorized each of its standing committees, and their subcommittees, "to fix a lesser number than one-third of its entire membership who shall constitute a quorum thereof for the purpose of taking sworn testimony." This amendment was the Senate's answer to the decision of the Supreme Court in the Christoffel case. Of 34 petitions filed during the 81st Congress to discharge House committees from the consideration of certain bills or resolutions, four obtained the required number of signatures and passed the House.

---

[19] This section was amended by *Public Law* 197, 80th Cong., to provide for the publication of this information concerning House committee employees in the *Congressional Record* instead of in the *Congressional Directory*. S. Res. 123, 80th Cong., made the same change for Senate committee personnel.

The Act restated the old rule that the authority of conference committees is limited to matters which are in disagreement between the two houses, while recognizing their right to report a substitute on the same subject matter. No points of order against conference reports under this rule have been sustained in recent years.[20] After an intensive study of 56 conference committees from the 70th to 80th Congresses, inclusive, Gilbert Steiner concludes that the influence of the House outweighed that of the Senate in 57 per cent of the cases.[21] A recent example of the triumph of Senate conferees, however, was seen in the conference report on the Executive Reorganization Act of 1949. Three matters were in dispute between the conferees on this bill: (1) the duration of the grant of reorganization power to the President; (2) the exemption of specified agencies from the scope of the Act; and (3) the legislative veto procedure: one- or two-house veto of the reorganization plans. After this bill had been deadlocked in conference for one month, the House conferees finally yielded on each of the issues. They limited the operation of the Act to four years; they eliminated the agency exemptions sought by the House; and they accepted the one-house veto procedure favored by the Senate.[22]

On September 15, 1950, the Senate agreed to a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 79) providing that every conference report shall be accompanied by a statement explaining the effect of the action agreed on by the conference committee. The House of Representatives had adopted a similar rule on February 27, 1880 (Rule XXVIII-1b). The Army Civil Functions Appropriation bill for fiscal 1950 was in conference from June 1 to October 3, 1949—a period longer than any within the memory of living Members. According to Rep. Cannon, "The delay was due to the unanimous objection of the managers on the part of the House to agreeing to exorbitant and unwarranted expenditure of public funds proposed by the other body."[23] One man's opinion of the power of conferees was reflected in a satirical speech by Senator Fulbright, who congratulated the conferees on the National Defense Appropriation bill "for so forthrightly disregarding the wishes of the common lay Members of the Senate and the House." He said:

---

[20] See *Congressional Record*, 80th Cong., 1st sess., pp. 6537–6539 (June 4, 1947), for a point of order against a conference report that was overruled by the Speaker.

[21] Gilbert Y. Steiner, *The Congressional Conference Committee* (1950), Ch. XII.

[22] For a full discussion of conference action on the Reorganization Act of 1949, see Ferrel Heady, "The Reorganization Act of 1949," *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 9, pp. 166–174 (Summer, 1949). For floor discussion of this conference report, see *Congressional Record*, 81st Cong., 1st sess., pp. 7747–7749; 7940–7941, 7983–7994 (June 13 and 16, 1949).

[23] *Ibid.*, p. 13970 (Oct. 3, 1949).

> I submit, Mr. President, in all sincerity that there is no need whatever for the ordinary, lay Member of Congress to come back to Washington for a special session. It is clearly evident, Mr. President, that to save the world and the people of this country from disaster, all that is needed is to reconvene, preferably in secret, only those incomparable sages, the conferees of the Appropriations Committee. From their deliberations the same results would be achieved and without the expense and trouble to everyone that is involved in going through the archaic ritual of pretended legislation. It is quite clear that regardless of what the common Members of this body may wish, the conferees make the decisions.[24]

Party ratios on the standing Senate committees have traditionally corresponded with the party division in the Senate. In accordance with this principle, during the 80th Congress there were 11 committees with a 7–6 ratio and three committees with an 8–5 ratio. Appropriations, with 21 members, was divided 12–9. In the 81st Congress there were six of the 7–6 committees and eight of the 8–5 committees, reflecting the shift in the party ratio in the whole body from 51–45 in 1947–48 to 54–42 in 1949–50. Appropriations was divided 13 to 8. In the 82nd Congress the party ratio is 7–6 on 14 of the Senate standing committees and 11–10 on Appropriations. It is a matter of voluntary discretion with the majority leadership to decide which shall be the 7–6 committees and which shall be divided 8–5.

When the Democrats announced their decision on January 5, 1949, as to the party ratios which would obtain on the Senate standing committees during the 81st Congress, Senator Vandenberg sharply protested the change in the ratio on Foreign Relations from 7–6 to 8–5. He regarded it as a departure from the spirit of bipartisan cooperation in foreign affairs and as implying that "Republican Senators are not quite trustworthy." Senator Barkley defended this change as justified by the shift in the political complexion of the Senate and as entirely free from partisan motivation. Four Democrats had lost seats on Foreign Relations in 1947 as a result of the Reorganization Act, but no Senator was to be removed from the committee in 1949 because of the change in ratio. (Hatch and Barkley retired from the Senate; Wagner asked to be transferred to Judiciary.)[25]

A majority of one on the 7–6 committees is a rather thin one on controversial issues. The question has been raised whether some change should be made to permit the majority party to exercise stronger committee control. It is pointed out that at present a single defection can upset majority control, as, for example, the defection of Senator Byrd on the nomination of Mon Wallgren as chairman of the National Security Resources Board.[26]

Party ratios on the standing committees of the House of Representatives are determined by agreement between the majority and minority leaders. Ways and Means is presently fixed at 15–10, Rules at 8–4. On the other House committees the ratio corresponds roughly, but not with mathematical precision, to the party division in the Chamber.

---

[24] *Ibid.*, 80th Cong., 2nd sess., p. 9206 (June 19, 1948).

[25] *Ibid.*, 81st Cong., 1st sess., pp. 53–56 (Jan. 5, 1949).

[26] For objections to such change, see testimony by Senator La Follette in the *Hearings* on Evaluation of the Legislative Reorganization Act, pp. 64–65.

Party policy committees were set up in the Senate in 1947 to plan the legislative program, coordinate and guide committee activity, focus party leadership, and strengthen party responsibility and accountability. The creation of such policy committees in both houses was originally recommended by the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress and in the Heller Report on *Strengthening the Congress*, and was approved by the Senate in passing the Legislative Reorganization bill. This provision was lost in the House, but it was restored for the Senate in the form of an item in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act.[27] Additional funds are obtained from the appropriation for clerical assistance to the Majority and Minority Conferences.

Both Senate party policy committees have now been operating actively for four years. They meet regularly each week while Congress is in session. During the 81st Congress the Democratic Policy Committee had six regular members: Lucas (chairman), Tydings, Russell, O'Mahoney, Green, and Hill; and two advisory members: McMahon (conference secretary) and Myers (party whip). It had a staff of two lawyers, one legislative analyst and three clerks. Meanwhile, the Republican Policy Committee had 11 members: Taft (chairman), Millikin (conference chairman), Young (conference secretary), Wherry (floor leader), Saltonstall (party whip), Bridges, Cordon, Hickenlooper, Ives, Margaret Smith, and Vandenberg. It had a staff of 12 employees, including a staff director, seven researchers, three clerks, and one secretary.

Republican policy committeemen are elected by their party conference for two-year terms and are limited to two consecutive terms. Democratic policy committeemen are appointed for an indefinite term by the party leader on authority of the party conference.

With the aid of their staffs, the Senate policy committees have performed a variety of useful functions. They have surveyed legislation pending before the standing committees and on the Senate calendar and, when in the majority, have scheduled business for floor consideration. They have met with the chairmen of standing committees to coordinate committee work. They have heard individual Senators present their views on matters of personal and party interest and have tried to reconcile divergent opinions in order to achieve party unity on legislative questions. They have considered and recommended with regard to Presidential nominations of national and party importance, advised on the institution of certain committee investigations, considered questions of parliamentary procedure, recommended the calling of party conferences and prepared broad statements of party policy. On occasion, the Senate Republican Policy Committee has met with its counterpart committee in the House. During the early months of the 80th Congress it employed a personnel adviser to assist the committees and members of the Senate with their staffing problems.

As devices for coordinating legislative policy-making and strengthening party leadership, the Senate policy committees have thus far failed to achieve their full potential. As instruments for promoting more effective liaison and cooperation with the President, they have also been a disappointment, partly because of the lack of similar party policy committees in the House of Representatives. Their limited achievements to date can be attributed, I suggest, to their composition, to the fragmentation of power in Congress and to the deep internal divisions within both of our major political parties. They are not composed of the chairmen of the standing committees, as was originally contemplated. Moreover, "the proliferation of leadership committees means that in neither house of Congress is there a body of party leaders who have the power of managing party affairs in Congress and who therefore can be held accountable for it. The result is that many things are left undone or—what is just as bad—are done in a dictatorial manner by individual party leaders. Also, too great a burden is thrown on the overworked Big Four and the Senate and House minority leaders."[28] But, as Victor Jones has pointed out, "The principal difficulty with developing party policy committees into an effective group of legislative leaders is that there is no congressional party to be led. The task is to develop parties to govern and to oppose the government. This cannot be done by designating a group of men, some of whom are not leaders in fact, as a party policy committee while Congress sub-contracts its work to committees and subcommittees."[29]

---

[27] For salaries and expenses of the Majority Policy Committee and the Minority Policy Committee, $45,715 for each such committee; in all, $91,430. *Public Law* 759, 81st Cong., 2nd sess., p. 2.

The parties in the House have continued their informal "steering" committees, which are roughly comparable to the Senate policy committees but have no staffs. The Republican Steering Committee, now called the House Republican Policy Committee, is presently composed of 21 members elected biennially: the floor leader (chairman), chairman of the party conference, secretary of the conference, party whip, chairman of the congressional committee, three chosen by the Committee on Committees, and 13 others selected on a geographical basis. It is an advisory committee to the Republican leadership and membership. It meets prior to any important action on the floor, discusses issues with committee members handling the bills, and reports its suggestions for action and policy to a party conference or through the whip organization. No major issue affecting national party policy is brought to the floor of the House with the consent of the Republican leadership until after a party conference has been held and the subject fully discussed. No Republican member of Congress is bound by the decisions of the policy committee, but its suggestions are designed to guide the members to a firmer national policy.

The Democratic Steering Committee in the House is composed at present of the Speaker, the majority floor leader, chairman of the party caucus, party whip, the chairmen of the Ways and Means, Appropriations, and Rules committees, and one representative from each of the 15 zones into which the country is divided for party purposes, each such representative being elected by the Democratic delegation from his zone in the House. This steering committee is, in effect, the executive committee of the caucus. It has the continuing responsibility of watching legislative developments and making decisions from day to day with respect to party action. In performing this function, it exercises wide discretionary powers.

---

[28] Committee on Political Parties, American Political Science Association, "Toward a More Responsible Two-Party System," AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE REVIEW, Supplement, Vol. 44, p. 59 (September, 1950).

[29] Victor Jones, in "The Social and Political Framework of Stabilization Policy," Ch. 2 of "Income Stabilization for a Developing Democracy" (unpublished ms., 1950), p. 37.

IV. STAFFING OF CONGRESS

More and better staff aids for members and committees of Congress were a major objective of the Act, and much progress in the staffing of Congress has been achieved. Most Senators have appointed administrative assistants, at $10,000 a year, who are helping them in many ways. Four of them are Senators' sons and many were formerly senatorial secretaries.[30] A similar provision for Congressmen was lost in the House, but the clerk hire allowance of each Representative has been raised to $12,500 a year. The staff of the Office of Legislative Counsel, established in 1919 to draft bills for members and committees of Congress, has also increased under the Act, from 11 to 28 persons. The Senate Office now has a staff of 14 persons—7 counsel, 3 law assistants, and 4 clerks; and the House Office is comprised of the same number, in the same capacities. The chief counsel are appointed by the President Pro Tempore and the Speaker, respectively, and they, in turn, appoint their staff members. The combined office, with a budget of $199,500 for fiscal 1951, is thus a permanent career staff independent of politics. The services rendered are of the highest quality.

Now in its thirty-fifth year, the Legislative Reference Service was greatly strengthened by the Act (section 203), as the research and reference arm of Congress. The duties of the Service were defined for the first time in statutory form, and the appointment of all necessary personnel was authorized "without regard to the civil service laws and without reference to political affiliations, solely on the ground of fitness to perform the duties of their office." Senior specialists were authorized to be appointed in some 19 subject fields "for special work with the appropriate committees of Congress." Under the Act, appropriations to the Service have increased from $178,000 in 1945 to $790,000 for fiscal 1951 and its staff has grown from 66 persons in 1945 to 156 in 1950, of whom 14 are political scientists. Fifteen senior specialists have been appointed in a dozen different fields. Several of them have been detailed to the professional staffs of congressional committees for varying periods and five (Elliott, Galloway, Graves, Kreps and Wilcox) have served as staff directors of such committees. In addition, several new types of service have been inaugurated in recent years, including the public affairs abstracts and bulletins, digests of committee hearings, and special studies for committees of Congress. Under the able guidance of Dr. Ernest S. Griffith, its director, there has been a steady upward trend in the congressional use of the Service during the past decade.[31]

---

[30] See the story of "Operation Falseface," by Howard M. Norton in the Baltimore *Sun*, March 6 and 7, 1947.

In the professional staffing of the standing committees the Act marked a real innovation. Section 202 authorized each standing committee (other than the Appropriations Committees, on which no staff ceiling was placed) to appoint "not more than four professional staff members . . . on a permanent basis without regard to political affiliations and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the office." In 1946, before this section became effective, Senate and House committees employed 356 clerks at a total annual payroll of $978,760. Few of them were professionals, with the exception of the staffs of the Appropriations committees, the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation and a few others. During 1950, after the Act had been in effect four years, the committees of Congress, standing, special and joint, had a combined staff of 673 persons and a total payroll of more than $3,000,000. Two hundred and eighty-six of them were classified as professionals: 98 were employed by House committees, 135 by Senate committees, and 53 by joint committees. Ten House and all 15 Senate standing committees had at least their full quota of four or more professional staff members. Five House committees and 11 Senate committees had received authority to expand their professional staffs beyond the figure of four fixed in the Act. Thus, the House Expenditures Committee with its subcommittees had a combined professional staff of 20 persons in 1950, while the Senate Judiciary Committee had 19 experts. Meanwhile, the House Appropriations Committee had 14 professionals, 18 clerks, and 42 special investigators on its payroll; and the Senate Appropriations Committee had 12 professionals and six clerks. Joint committee professional staffs ranged from one on the Byrd Committee to 17 on Internal Revenue Taxation.

A survey of the professional staffs of congressional committees, made in 1949, showed that 43 per cent of them were lawyers, 43 per cent had formerly been employed in the executive branch of the national government,[32] 68 per cent had previous congressional experience and 81 per cent were college graduates. Lawyers constituted the largest single occupational group, with a scattering of economists, political scientists and engineers. Their basic annual compensation ranged from $5,000 to $8,000, which grossed $7,775 to $10,846. About half of them received the maximum salary.

The authors of the Legislative Reorganization Act recommended creation of an office of Personnel Director for the Congress who would develop a modern personnel system for all its employees and abolish the patronage system; but this provision was lost in the Senate debate. In its place, Mr. George Smith, secretary of the Senate Republican Policy Committee, developed a plan for the efficient professional and clerical staffing of the committees of the Senate and circulated it among their chairmen on the eve of the 80th Congress.[33] Mr. Smith was also instrumental in the appointment early in 1947 of a personnel adviser who was of material assistance in the staffing of the Senate during the first session of the 80th Congress. Meanwhile, the writer developed a set of job specifications for the new professional and clerical positions on all the reorganized standing committees of both houses, and some use was made of it.

---

[31] In 1947 the Office of Coordinator of Information for the House of Representatives was created. This Office renders a general information service to members of the House. It has a small staff of nine persons and a budget of $69,000 for 1951. The Coordinator is appointed by the Speaker and is compensated at the rate of $12,000 a year. H. Res. 183, 81st Cong., 1st sess.

[32] Section 202(g) of the Act forbade the appointment of any professional staff member to any position in the executive branch for one year after his committee service. But this prohibition was repealed by *Public Law* 8 of the 81st Congress.

After four years of their full-scale operation, the quality of the professional staffs appears mixed. About half of the standing committees today are staffed with well-trained and competent experts in the fields involved. Their handiwork is reflected in the improved performance of their committees, more adequate records, better hearings and reports, more effective liaison between committees and the corresponding administrative agencies, and general improvement in efficiency. Many committees have carried out the intent of the Act in the appointment and retention of qualified people. On the other hand, about half of the committees seem to be poorly or inadequately staffed by persons selected with political considerations in mind. At the opening of the 81st Congress, with the change in party control of both houses, there was a turnover of one-third among the professional staffs of the standing committees —which meant that around two-thirds of the incumbent employees were retained from the 80th Congress, despite Senator McGrath's remark that it might be necessary to find some "Democratic experts." By and large, the conclusions reached by Gladys Kammerer in 1949 are still valid: that not all members of Congress know how to use staff; that some members use staff data to support preconceived ideas or party dictates; that some professional staff people feel frustrated by the subordination of facts to political exigencies and sectional prejudices, and by the occasional inactivity of their committees; that political considerations are often paramount in staffing; that systematic personnel arrangements are still lacking in committee staffing; and that there is room for improvement both in the quality of professional staff and in the processes of recruitment and selection.[34]

According to Ernest Griffith's evaluation of committee staffing, "some committees have survived changes in party control without impairment, largely in instances in which party considerations did not influence the original appointments. In other instances a reasonable stability has been secured by the division of appointments between the parties. Others have been partisan. Lawyers and journalists have been employed in considerable numbers, economists and subject specialists perhaps somewhat less so than would have been anticipated. A few have been obtained on loan from the Legislative Reference

[33] George H. E. Smith, *Memorandum on Committee Staff Organization*, to Chairmen of Senate Committees. Undated, 13 pp.

[34] Gladys M. Kammerer, *The Staffing of the Committees of Congress* (Lexington, Ky., 1949), pp. 38–43.

Service, and this has resulted in almost perfect integration of the two agencies in those cases in which this took place."[35]

In the absence of a personnel director, no one is so centrally situated as to be able to evaluate all of the professional committee staffs. But committee staffing appears to be still in transition from the old patronage system to a modern merit system. Congress is handicapped by the lack of a modern system of personnel administration. If it needed a Congressional Personnel Office in 1945, as the La Follette-Monroney committee said it did, it needs it more than ever today to help members and committees with their staffing problems, to secure the selection of qualified personnel and to develop safeguards of tenure. Experience has also shown that the limit on the number of professionals imposed by the Act is too low and should be lifted, that there has been little coordination of staff work between the twin committees of the two houses, that larger staffs are needed to assist the more active committees with their onerous legislative and supervisory duties, and that Representatives from the more populous districts should be given administrative assistants such as Senators now have.

Seen in historical perspective, "this Act marked the birth of a full-fledged congressional staff," as Ernest Griffith has recently observed. Although the results of its operation have been uneven with respect to the quality of staff for committees, members of Congress and subject-matter fields, striking gains have been achieved. Total appropriations for committee staffs, the Legislative Reference Service and the Office of Legislative Counsel have multiplied fivefold since 1944. They amount to more than $5,000,000 for fiscal 1951. The staffing of Congress effected by the Act has introduced a "third force of experts, usually designed as a corrective to the bias of the special interests and to the substantive recommendations of the executive. . . . The enlargement and strengthening of the staffs of Congress have in fact been the major factor in arresting and probably reversing a trend . . . in the direction of the ascendancy or even the virtually complete dominance of the bureaucracy over the legislative branch through the former's near-monopoly . . . of technical competence. . . . Congress has mastered—or has provided itself with the tools to master—the problem of assuring itself of an unbiased, competent source of expert information and analysis which is its very own."[36]

V. CHANGES IN WORK LOAD

Another major objective of the La Follette-Monroney committee was to reduce the work load on Congress caused by non-legislative duties and by the consideration of private and local legislation. To this end, it recommended more staff aids for members and committees, expansion of the bill-drafting and legislative reference services, creation of a stenographic pool, reduction in committee assignments to one or two per member, delegation of private claims, and home rule for the District of Columbia. Most of these recommendations were embodied in the Act.

---

[35] In Chapter VI of his *Stokes Lectures*, to be delivered at New York University in April, 1951. [36] *Idem.*

In practice, the work load of committees has more than doubled since 1946 in terms of the number of measures referred to and reported by them.[37] The ban upon the introduction of four categories of private bills, imposed by section 131 of the Act, effected some reduction in the private bill work load in the 80th Congress; but this gain was lost in the 81st Congress when 1,052 private laws were enacted, which was 55 per cent of all laws passed prior to the "lame duck" session. The continuing flood of private bills consists largely of claims bills, whose introduction is still permitted under the exceptions allowed by the Federal Tort Claims Act (Title IV of the Legislative Reorganization Act), and private immigration bills whose introduction is unrestricted. In 1949 Congress received a record total of 1,351 private bills designed to permit aliens to enter or to remain within the United States, reflecting the efforts of displaced persons to find permanent refuge within our borders. In addition, the 80th Congress widened the power of the Attorney General to stay the deportation of aliens here illegally. Such suspensions must be confirmed in each individual case by concurrent resolution of Congress; 5,000 cases were handled in 1949–50 by the Judiciary committees, whose calendars are engulfed by the rising flood of private bills.[38]

Despite the effort of the Act to distribute the legislative work load more evenly among the standing committees of Congress, the burden in practice varies within wide limits from time to time and from session to session, depending upon the nature of the national and international problems that are paramount at the time. The Appropriations and Foreign Relations committees have been among the hardest working since the War because of the importance of their measures and mounting international problems. The authors of the Act never asserted that structural reforms in our legislative machinery would reduce the volume of congressional business. The burden of this business has inevitably become increasingly onerous with the steady expansion of governmental activities at home and abroad in recent decades. The purpose of the changes in committee structure was not so much to reduce the work load as it was to effect a more systematic and rational division of labor among the reorganized committees. The reorganization of committee work is an improvement over the previous situation because it has eliminated many duplicating and overlapping jurisdictions and has consolidated related functions.

The work load of individual members of Congress has not been lightened by the Act, but more and better staff aids have enabled them to do a better job. Administrative assistants to Senators have helped them immeasurably with their departmental business, constituent inquiries, and speech writing. Enlargement of the Legislative Reference Service has been followed by a great increase in its use by individual members for legislative research, speech writing, fact finding, and answering constituent inquiries. The Service is currently handling congressional inquiries at the rate of more than 38,000 a year. And, as we have seen, one measure of the effect of the Act on the individual work load is seen in the limitation of standing committee assignments to one per member in the House and to two per member in the Senate, with minor exceptions. This reduction has been offset in part by service on subcommittees and on special and joint committees, yet there was a decline of 50 per cent from 1946 to 1949 in the average number of committee assignments of all kinds for each Senator.

---

[37] In the 79th Congress, 7,239 measures were referred to, and 2,728 were reported by, the standing committees. In the 81st Congress, not including the "lame duck" session, 16,328 measures were referred and 5,716 were reported.

[38] For a full description of this situation, see my memorandum on "The Reform of Private Bill Procedure," *Congressional Record,* 81st Cong., 1st sess., pp. A3047–A3050 (May 12, 1949).

Despite these gains, the burden of work imposed upon the members and committees of Congress by their legislative and investigative duties and by the importunities of constituents is truly enormous. According to George Smith, a close observer of the congressional scene, the work load is more than they can handle. "There are now signs that the limits of capacity have been reached. . . . This enormous extension of activities of the Federal Government generates a volume of detailed and complex business which I believe has gone beyond the capacity of Congress to handle. . . . A law of diminishing returns is actively at work in the field of Federal Government. . . . The work load is beyond effective legislative control."[39]

If Congress desires to lighten the mounting burden of its business, several steps are available. It could complete the evolution begun in 1946 by (a) repealing section 421 of the Federal Tort Claims Act, which excepts twelve classes of claims from its provisions, (b) delegating the adjustment of immigration and deportation cases to the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and (c) delegating the issuance of land patents to the Bureau of Land Management or to the Bureau of Indian Affairs in the Department of the Interior. Senator Wiley, who was chairman of Judiciary in the 80th Congress, has suggested that the introduction of private bills could be banned in both houses merely by amending their standing rules.[40] Congress could grant home rule to the District of Columbia and thus get rid of its duties as a city council for the city of Washington. The Kefauver home rule bill passed the Senate in May, 1949, but has been pigeon-holed ever since in the House District Committee. It could prohibit its members from appearing before administrative agencies on the claims and complaints of their constituents, as Professor Lawrence Chamberlain has suggested.[41] It could try to reduce the magnitude of Federal operations via the devolution of appropriate functions to state and regional authorities, as George Smith has urged.[42] It could authorize members of the House of Representatives to employ administrative assistants such as Senators now have. It could save much of its time every session through voting by electricity and through the central scheduling of committee meetings to avoid conflicts. And it could expedite its business by staggering committee meetings and chamber sessions on alternate days. Taken together, these steps would go far to bring the work load of our national legislature within its capacity to carry.

---

[39] See his testimony in *Hearings* on Evaluation of the Legislative Reorganization Act, pp. 170–180.

[40] *Ibid.*, pp. 253–254.

[41] *Ibid.*, p. 264.

[42] *Ibid.*, p. 180. Mr. Smith has also suggested creation of an Advisory Council on Federal Legislation to screen proposals for new Federal functions and agencies.

VI. OVERSIGHT OF ADMINISTRATION

Another main objective of the Act was to promote closer cooperation and better relationships between the executive and legislative branches. To this end the standing committees were directed (section 136) to exercise "continuous watchfulness" of the execution of the laws by the administrative agencies under their jurisdiction. In recommending "legislative oversight by standing committees," the La Follette-Monroney committee observed that "without effective legislative oversight of the activities of the vast executive branch, the line of democracy wears thin. . . . We feel that this oversight problem can be handled best by directing the regular standing committees of the Senate and House, which have such matters in their jurisdiction, to conduct a continuous review of the agencies administering laws originally reported by the committees. . . . Such review might well include a question period by the committee. . . . We recommend that the practice of creating special committees of investigation be abandoned. . . . By directing its standing committees to perform this oversight function, Congress can help to overcome the unfortunate cleavage between the personnel of the legislative and executive branches."

Some critics of the Act have alleged that this section provided, in effect, for duplicating and overlapping investigations of the executive branch of the government by many committees. But it was the intention of the authors of the Act to bring about a three-way division of labor in the performance of the oversight function. Their thought was that the Appropriations committees, on the one hand, would exercise financial control before expenditure through scrutiny of the departmental estimates; that the Expenditures committees, on the other hand, would undertake to review administrative structure and procedures and that the legislative committees would review the operation of substantive legislation and consider the need of statutory amendments.

This feature of the Act has met with only partial success to date. Many standing committees have been too heavily burdened with their legislative duties and limited staffs to keep very close watch upon the executive agencies within their jurisdiction. A survey of committee activity during the second session of the 81st Congress shows that ten standing and five special committees of Congress were carrying on special investigations of matters which involved some oversight of executive activities. The most active committees in this field have been the Appropriations, Expenditures, Armed Services, and Commerce committees. Perhaps the most publicized inquiry last year was that by a subcommittee of Foreign Relations into charges of disloyalty among Department of State personnel. A new "watchdog subcommittee" of the Senate Armed Services Committee, set up last July under the chairmanship of Senator Lyndon B. Johnson, is probing deeply into the administration of the national defense program. The detailed results achieved by these supervisory committees are set forth in their reports.[43] The work of certain government corporations such as the Maritime Commission, subversive activities in government, national defense preparations, and the manipulations of the "five per centers" have been among the chief fields of legislative oversight in recent years.

Parliamentary government has almost disappeared in Europe. Its survival in the United States largely depends upon congressional oversight of administration. Administrative agencies are responsible for making decisions within the policy standards and procedural machinery fixed by statute, subject to judicial review to assure compliance with the statutory requirements. Congress is responsible for amending the law if a change in standards or methods of procedure proves necessary, and legislative oversight of agency operations is the means by which Congress discharges its responsibility. Creation in recent years of several so-called "watchdog committees" in such fields as atomic energy control, foreign aid, Federal expenditures, and defense production has focused attention on this oversight function. The joint committee is a useful device for performing this function because its duties are explicitly assigned by statute. Seniority does not apply in its selection, and it thus provides an outlet for the zest and zeal of younger members. The joint committee is also a valuable instrument of legislative surveillance and statutory amendment in experimental and controversial fields where economic stability and national security are at stake. In times of crisis, with growing concentration of power in the executive, more energetic performance of the oversight function would appear to be in the public interest, provided that both Congress and the agencies keep within their respective spheres of responsibility.

In exercising its oversight function Congress has available several tools. It can first of all study the periodic and special reports which the agencies submit to the legislature. These reports contain valuable information on agency operations and expenditures, their administration of the statutes and particular problem areas. Investigations of particular agencies may be conducted by the Appropriations or Expenditure committees, by the standing committees charged with jurisdiction over their activities, by the joint watchdog committees such as the Atomic Energy Committee, or by special committees such as the Kefauver Committee on Interstate Crime. An appropriations committee may look into an agency's budget requests to see if they are excessive or inadequate, comparing notes meanwhile with the appropriate standing or watchdog committee concerned. An expenditures committee may make a post-audit of an agency's administration of its affairs to see if it has been economical or wasteful. A legislative committee may hold hearings or an informal question period with agency officials to determine whether or not they are enforcing a statute in accordance with the legislative intent, or to discuss constituent complaints concerning alleged agency abuses of authority, or to consider proposed legislation in the light of past decisions and regulations. A joint watchdog committee may be used to investigate novel or emergent problems of mutual interest to both houses, such as the international control of the hydrogen bomb or raw material shortages. Or a special committee may be set up to investigate a particular problem or agency, such as speculative transactions on the commodity markets by government employees or the Federal Communications Commission. In general, I believe that the oversight function should be exercised by standing rather than special investigating committees. The latter trespass upon the assigned jurisdiction of the standing committees; they lack continuity and legislative authority; and they impair the efficiency of the administrative agencies of the government by requiring their officials to repeat their testimony on the same subjects before several committees of Congress in cases where legislative action is indicated. Special committees may also be used for partisan or personal purposes.

---

[43] For good examples of committee reports reflecting the oversight function, see *House Report* No. 2433, 80th Cong., 2nd sess.; *Senate Doc.* No. 4, 81st Cong., 1st sess.; *Senate Report* No. 5, 81st Cong., 1st sess.

Another tool in the oversight kit is the committee report evaluating agency operation and suggesting changes in current administration of existing law. Good examples of such reports were the activities reports of the Senate Expenditures Committee and its Investigations Subcommittee at the end of the 80th Congress, and the series of intermediate reports on various agencies and commissions issued by the House Expenditures Committee during the 81st Congress. Such reports are not necessary under the Legislative Reorganization Act, but they are required of the watchdog committees created by the Taft-Hartley Act and the Atomic Energy Act.

Informal conferences at the committee and/or staff level with agency officials is another method which has proved helpful in performing the oversight function. First used by Chairman Lanham and Administrator Blandford on national housing matters, this method has helped resolve complaints and misunderstandings, made for closer cooperation, and laid a foundation of mutual respect and confidence. During the second session of the 80th Congress, the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce held a series of such meetings with representatives of 14 regulatory agencies in its field. The committee stated that these meetings enabled it to exercise closer supervision over these agencies; that they were a means of acquainting the new members of the committee with the activities with which they would become concerned; and that they provided a channel for the various agencies to present their ideas to the committee concerning possible measures for improving their work or making it more effective.[44] Although only a few committees have made sporadic use of this conference technique for oversight purposes, the practice might well be extended of holding periodic meetings at the subcommittee-commission level or of increasing the use of qualified staff personnel to study the problems of particular agencies. To this end some expansion of the professional staffs of the supervisory committees appears necessary.

Although routine inquiries are in order, intervention of individual members of Congress in the affairs of administrative agencies with a view to expediting or influencing agency decisions on behalf of constituents is considered improper when the Congressmen are not members of the corresponding supervisory committee. It was the intention of the authors of the Legislative Reorganization Act that the oversight committees would serve as a "clearing house" to which Members would refer all such constituent complaints and inquiries and which would then bring them to the attention of the agencies concerned. The volume and character of such complaints would be a rough index of the performance and weaknesses of the agency. At the same time, as the Hoover Commission *Task Force Report on Regulatory Commissions* remarked, "this method would shield both the Congressman and the commission from the suspicion of influence inherent in direct approaches for constituents."[45]

---

[44] *Activity of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, 80th Cong. House Report* No. 2433, 80th Cong., 2nd sess., pp. 2–3.

In a lucid analysis of the oversight problem, the Committee on Administrative Law of the Bar Association of New York City states that "vigilant and conscientious exercise of proper oversight and consultation are much to be desired and encouraged." The problem is one of achieving a "suitable accommodation of popular control and flexible administrative expertness." The analysis also suggests the advisability of erecting certain self-imposed boundaries. Legislative committees ought not to try to influence the decisions of pending cases, issues before an agency, or the manner in which a particular case is being handled—"a precept not universally respected in practice." Nor should decided cases be criticized with a view to influencing an agency to reverse a previous ruling or to limit a trend in agency decisions, except when a committee is genuinely considering amending the statute. However, it is considered proper for a committee to make suggestions to an agency with respect to its procedures or internal organization and to comment upon proposed substantive rules.[46]

VII. STRENGTHENING FISCAL CONTROLS

One of the major aims of the Act was to strengthen the congressional power of the purse. To this end, the Act provided for a legislative budget (section 138), development of a standard appropriation classification schedule (section 139b), studies by the Comptroller General of restrictions in the appropriation acts (section 205), expenditure analyses by the Comptroller General (section 206), studies by both Appropriations committees of permanent appropriations and of the disposition of funds resulting from the sale of Government property or services (section 139d), and expansion of the staffs of the committees on Appropriations (section 202b).

In practice, many of the fiscal reforms embodied in the Act have been virtually ignored or have failed to work. Attempts to carry out the legislative budget provision during 1947–49 proved abortive; in 1950 this section was ignored and it now appears to be a dead letter. In congressional circles the aim of the legislative budget is generally regarded as laudable, but experience with it seems to have shown that the instrument is not properly suited to its task. Its failure to date is attributed to the shortness of time allowed for the job, the unwieldy size of the Joint Budget Committee, inadequate staffing, improper adjustment to the appropriation process, resistance within Congress to ceilings on appropriations for favorite agencies, current Federal accounting practices, and external spending pressures on the legislature. However, there is strong sentiment in Congress for further trial of the legislative budget idea, and measures have been introduced to amend section 138 of the Act with a view to overcoming the difficulties mentioned above.

---

[45] Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, *Task Force Report on Regulatory Commissions* (Washington, 1949), pp. 37–38.

[46] "Congressional Oversight of Administrative Agencies," *The Record of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York*, Vol. 5, pp. 11–29 (January, 1950).

The Wherry resolution (S. Con. Res. 38, 81st Cong., 1st Sess.), presented on May 11, 1949, by a bipartisan group of eight Senators, would reduce the Joint Budget Committee to 20 members, and would authorize it to employ an expert staff and to report a legislative budget with a recommended ceiling on expenditures by February 15. There would be no formal adoption of the budget by concurrent resolution under the Wherry plan. This resolution was reported favorably by the Senate Rules Committee on April 14, 1950, and has been on the Senate Calendar ever since.

The McClellan bill (S. 2898, 81st Cong. 2d Sess.) introduced on January 19, 1950, would repeal section 138 of the Act and create in its place a Joint Congressional Committee on the Budget to carry on a continuing, year-round study of budget requests and requirements. It would be a ten-member group, with five members selected from the Appropriations Committee of each house. It would make its reports to these committees and to other standing committees. Every Federal agency would be required to submit to the joint committee a duplicate of any money request made to the Budget Bureau. This requirement, which would apply to both regular and supplemental appropriations and would include the detailed justification data filed by each agency in support of its request for funds, would permit a long-term study of each agency's needs and of its own requests for funds, as well as of the amount which the Budget Bureau finally asks Congress to authorize. Aside from this detailed study of each agency's budget requests and requirements, the joint committee would make periodic reports on any improper uses of funds or deviations from congressional authorizations, on methods of achieving greater economy and efficiency, and on estimated revenues and general economic conditions.[47]

The need of simplifying and standardizing the pattern of the appropriation bills, which the Act called for and which the Hoover Commission recommended, has been carried out in part in the 1951 performance budget and in the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950.[48]

The studies by the Comptroller General on useless restrictions in appropriation bills were completed in January, 1949, and will probably result in the elimination of many obsolete provisions which have been carried on from year to year in the supply bills. But the expenditure analyses of government departments which he was directed to make, so as "to enable Congress to determine whether public funds have been economically and efficiently administered and expended," have not yet been made because funds for the purpose have been denied by the Appropriations Committee.

---

[47] For a fuller account of experience with the legislative budget, see my Public Affairs Bulletin No. 80, *Reform of the Federal Budget* (April, 1950), pp. 47–48, 100–110. See also A. S. Mike Monroney in *The Strengthening of American Political Institutions*, pp. 17–20; and his testimony at the *Hearings* on Evaluation of the Legislative Reorganization Act, pp. 84–87.

[48] Galloway, *Reform of the Federal Budget*, pp. 70–72.

No systematic study of permanent appropriations appears to have been made, although the House subcommittees reviewed these items during their 1948 hearings and the Senate committee gave them considerable attention during 1947–49.

On the staffing of the Appropriations committees, the La Follette-Monroney committee recommended that four qualified staff assistants be assigned to each of the subcommittees on a year-round basis. But at the insistence of the leaders of the House Appropriations Committee, a change was made and they were authorized by the Act to employ whatever staff they considered necessary. "This was done," according to Rep. Monroney, "in the belief that they would add sufficient professional personnel to gain a complete understanding of every item in every appropriation request."[49] In practice, the staff of the House Appropriations Committee has been increased above the stenographic grade from 11 clerks in 1946 to 17 clerks during the six-month period from January 1, 1950, to June 30, 1950. During the same period the committee also employed an investigative staff consisting of two full-time investigators, 23 part-time investigators borrowed from 12 administrative agencies, 11 temporary clerical and editorial assistants borrowed from 10 agencies on a reimbursable basis, and 4 clerk-stenographers. Total expenditures for the combined clerical and investigative staff for the fiscal year 1950 amounted to $290,628.98.[50] No administrative analysts or professional staff have been employed by the House committee "because of a conviction that professional and clerical staff impede each other."[51] Thus, considering both the clerical and investigative staff, the combined 42-man staff handled a work load of appropriations during 1950 of more than one billion dollars per staff member. "No one can question the ability of those employed," observes Mr. Monroney, "but I feel that a greatly enlarged staff would enable the committee to ferret out of the money bills much more information and facts regarding the agencies than is now done with the small staffs used."[52]

During the 80th Congress, on the other hand, the Senate Appropriations Committee took advantage of the Act's authority to recruit a professional staff of eight experienced persons, in addition to the regular clerical and investigative force. And during the first six months of 1950 this committee had a staff of 6 clerks, 6 professionals and 6 clerical assistants, at a total gross annual salary for the fiscal year of $132,927. The Senate committee needs a smaller staff than the House committee because the former sits and holds hearings only on specific appeals from House decisions.

---

[49] *Hearings* on the Legislative Reorganization Act, pp. 86–87.

[50] As reported by Chairman Clarence Cannon, *Congressional Record*, 81st Cong., 2nd sess., p. 11054 (July 24, 1950).

[51] Kammerer, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

[52] *The Strengthening of American Political Institutions*, p. 20.

Thus, the greatest failure of reorganization has been in the field of more effective fiscal control. This failure was offset in part in 1950 by the consolidation of eleven separate supply bills into one omnibus appropriation bill for the first time in more than a century and a half. Hitherto, the supply bills have gone through the legislative process in piecemeal fashion. Last year they were merged into one measure which was ready for the President's signature two full months ahead of the budget completion date in 1949. This big money bill represents a forward step in appropriation procedure in that, by bringing all the general supply bills together into a single measure, it gives Congress and the country a picture of the total outlay contemplated for the coming fiscal year. The new procedure also permits a comparison of total proposed appropriations with the latest available estimates of total Treasury receipts. This comparison enables Congress to decide in its wisdom whether to balance the budget, to create a surplus for debt retirement, or to incur an increase in the public debt. The new procedure also allows Congress to see the claims of spending pressure groups in relation to the total national fiscal picture and thus to appraise their relative worth. The consolidated supply bill procedure falls short, however, of the objectives of the legislative budget in that it does not fix a ceiling on expenditures or give a coordinated view of prospective income and outgo. (But no ceiling on expenditures could long contain the huge current outlays for national defense.)

VIII. LIGHT ON LOBBYING

Title III of the Act requires persons whose principal paid activity is seeking to influence Federal legislation to register and file quarterly financial statements of receipts and expenditures with the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House. The La Follette-Monroney committee had recommended that *all* lobbyists should register and file statements; it did not intend that registration and reporting should be limited to persons "principally" engaged in lobbying. The joint committee was led by testimony it heard, as well as by its own independent studies, to believe that the registration of the representatives of organized groups would "enable Congress better to evaluate and determine evidence, data, or communications from organized groups seeking to influence legislative action" and thus avoid the distortion of public opinion. It was also influenced by the recommendation of the Committee on Congress of the American Political Science Association in 1945 that "all groups, representatives of which appear before congressional committees, should register and make full disclosure of their membership, finances, and so forth." The joint committee believed that inclusion of a lobby title in the Act would strengthen the Congress by "enabling it better to meet its responsibilities under the Constitution." To turn the spotlight of publicity on lobbying activities and expenditures would be a big step forward, they felt. After the lobby law had been in operation for a few years, it was hoped that experience would reveal any defects which could be corrected by amending and strengthening the Act.[53]

In practice, the administration of the lobby law has furnished Congress and the country with more useful and important information about lobbyists—their identity, sponsorships, sources of support, and legislative interests—than has ever been known before. The compilations of filings and financial data which are published quarterly in the *Congressional Record* provide a wealth of informative data on the activities of these gentry. The facts on lobbying for the first quarter of 1950, for example, consumed 177 pages of the *Record* of July 14, 1950, and reflected the work of the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, which secured adoption of a new standard reporting form and achieved a record of outstanding compliance with the law.[54] Under the chairmanship of Hon. Frank Buchanan, this committee made an objective and intensive study during 1949–50 of lobbying by private groups and individuals and government agencies: extent of activity by each group, fund-raising and lobbying techniques, grass-roots pressure, causes and costs of lobbying, etc. The study shed much fresh light on modern methods of lobbying and recommended several improvements in the law.[55]

Administration of the lobby law has been handicapped by its vagueness and ambiguities. Many organizations and individuals who are engaged in influencing legislation have not complied with the Act, on advice of counsel, because they claim that their "principal purpose" is not to influence legislation. They claim that "principal" means "primary" or "major." Many persons have registered who disclaim that they are engaged in lobbying, or who assert that lobbying is only incidental to their other activities. An analysis by W. Brooke Graves of experience under the lobby law during the 80th Congress showed that, of 1807 organizations maintaining offices in Washington, 667 registered during 1947 and 725 during 1948. Eight hundred and thirty-five organizations failed to register either year, although representatives of 298 of them appeared before the Judiciary Committees during 1947–48.[56] By the end of 1949 a total of 2,878 persons and groups had filed under the lobby law, of which 495 were original filings; their reports showed that they had collected more than $55,000,000 since the act went into effect and had spent more than $27,000,000.[57] Dr. Graves concludes that it is almost impossible to estimate the extent of compliance with the lobby law. "While the existing law marks a significant advance, its provisions are in urgent need of strengthening and revision, if the objectives of the framers are to be fully realized."[58]

---

[53] *Cf.* testimony by George B. Galloway before the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, March 28, 1950, Part I, pp. 97–105.

[54] See statement by Hon. Frank Buchanan, *Congressional Record*, 81st Cong., 2nd sess., pp. A5411–A5413 (July 17, 1950).

[55] See General Interim and Final Reports of the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, *House Reports* No. 3138 and 3239, 81st Cong., 2nd sess.

[56] W. Brooke Graves, *Administration of the Lobby Registration Provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946: An Analysis of Experience during the Eightieth Congress* (Washington, 1950).

[57] Hearings before the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, Part I, p. 112.

Impartial students of the subject are agreed that there is urgent need for some kind of supervision and control over lobbying in Washington; that the lobby law of 1946 suffers from defective draftsmanship; and that it should be revised and clarified after a thorough investigation of the whole problem such as the Buchanan committee has now made. Specific suggestions for revision include clarification of the law's terminology, coverage and filing requirements; centralization of responsibility for its administration in a specific agency equipped with an adequate full-time staff to file, tabulate and analyze registrations and financial reports, and to investigate compliance with the act; provision for termination of inactive registrations; exact specification of financial data required; requirement of submission of full information regarding an organization's membership, internal structure and methods of policy determination; and extension of the act's application to lobbying before administrative agencies as well as before Congress.[59]

IX. COMPENSATION AND RETIREMENT

The final aim of the Act, and one which probably sweetened the pill of its passage, was the provision raising congressional salaries 25 per cent to $12,500 a year, granting each Member a tax-exempt expense allowance of $2,500 a year and extending to Members of Congress optional retirement coverage under the Civil Service Retirement Act. The salary boost was designed to help Members meet the rising cost of living and campaigning. The allowance was to assist in defraying expenses incurred in the discharge of official duties. It was hoped that the eligibility to participate in the Federal retirement system on a contributory basis might both encourage superannuated Members to retire and conduce to a greater sense of security and independence of thought and action on the part of the younger members.

The salary increase and expense allowance became effective on the day on which the 80th Congress convened. To be entitled to a retirement annuity a Member of Congress must have served at least six years, have attained the age of 62, and have contributed a percentage of his base pay to the retirement fund at the rate provided by the Retirement Act. The annuity of Members of Congress consists of 2.5 per cent of their average salary received as a Member, multiplied by their years of service. As of June 30, 1950, 52 former Congressmen were drawing annuity benefits. As of August 3, 1950, 476 Congressmen and Senators were contributing to the civil service annuity fund.

Some who have analyzed the responsibilities, duties and importance of the congressional job believe that it is worth a salary of $25,000 and that the expenses of the job call for such a salary. They assert that congressional salaries should be such that members would have no excuse for augmenting their income by means which might be prejudicial to the effectiveness of their work; and that the salary should be such as to widen the field that could be drawn upon for congressional talent and thus in the long run raise the level of legislative ability. It is also urged that the salary should be sufficient to lead toward the desirable objective of upgrading the salaries of all public service positions.[60]

---

[58] *Ibid.*, pp. 106–107.

[59] *Idem.* See also Belle Zeller, "The Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act," AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE REVIEW, Vol. 42, pp. 268–271 (April, 1948).

X. CONCLUSION

In summary, we can report that the basic reforms in committee structure have survived four years' trial and worked well on the whole. Committee procedure has been improved and regularized in several respects, although some jurisdictional disputes still occur. Party policy committees have functioned actively in the Senate, but have failed to achieve their full potential. Striking gains have been achieved in the staffing of Congress, but there is room for improvement in the quality of professional committee staffs and in the methods of their selection. Congress is handicapped by the lack of a modern personnel system, but its new staff aids have apparently arrested its decline in relation to the executive branch. The work load on Congress has not been reduced by the Act, but more and better staff aids have enabled it to do a better job. The Judiciary committees are overburdened with thousands of private bills about matters which should be handled elsewhere. Operation of the oversight function has been partially successful and various devices are available for its fuller performance. The fiscal control provisions of the Act have either been ignored or have proved unworkable in practice. In fact, the greatest failure of congressional reorganization has been in the fiscal control field. Administration of the lobby law has disclosed a wealth of new information concerning the identity and finances of lobbyists, but has been handicapped by defects in the statute, which needs revision and clarification. Congressional salaries have been raised and 476 of 531 Members of Congress are presently participating in the Federal retirement plan.

Representative government has broken down or disappeared in other countries. Here in the United States it remains on trial. Its survival may well depend upon its ability to cope quickly and adequately with the difficult problems of a dangerous world. Congress is the central citadel of American democracy and our chief defense against dictatorship. Hence the importance of congressional reorganization and of further steps toward strengthening our national legislature.

---

[60] See testimony of William T. Rhame, of Robert Heller and Associates, in *Hearings* before Subcommittee No. 4 of the House Judiciary Committee, February 9, 1945.

RESEARCH IN THE POLITICAL PROCESS*

OLIVER GARCEAU
Bennington College

A discipline, like an individual, may in some measure be known by the dilemmas it keeps, or more properly by the manner in which it keeps them.

A central conceptual controversy, probably inescapable for political scientists because of their disciplinary heritage, is that involved in perceiving uniformities in behavior, describing recurring patterns, identifying the determinants and yet reconciling this effort and its underlying premises about the roots of behavior with the liberal, democratic faith in man's individual capacity to determine his own ends, to think rationally and to reach individual and creative decisions. On this faith rests the political structure of rights, the machinery of the democratic electorate, the party system and the values of the constitutional democratic state whose political process we are concerned to describe and analyze. Cultural anthropologists, social psychologists of many disciplinary schools, hard-boiled "realists" in political science, have recently drawn back from determinist or whole-heartedly relativist positions. Some are concerned that political science, in a fresh enthusiasm for empirical research, may become so engrossed with uniformities and determinants that it will obscure or abandon the normative commitments of a democratic polity.

Students of political behavior need not grasp either horn of such a dilemma in order to push on with their immediately pressing work. Their commitments to constitutional democracy can remain imbedded in philosophical and historical analysis, or conceivably in such empirical evidence as derives from modern studies of comparative cultures. Not only is the liberal faith no barrier to research in political behavior. More than this, our frame of reference concerning the good society is, as commonly observed, essential in threefold fashion: as a determinant of priorities in research, as datum of political behavior and as guide to the use of new insights and understanding. Present needs in research are not such as to press for a final answer to the questions of determinism and hypothetical ultimate capacity to describe fully and thus to predict. The next steps required are to describe in even gross and impressionistic terms the major outlines of the political process of modern democratic society, to refine the data and render it precise, to the extent that research can be designed to make this possible, and to develop a conceptual scheme that will place data in meaningful context. These tasks have not been completed. The very effort to develop a systematic study of political life, from whatever moral premises, necessarily assumes wide areas of uniformity, recurring patterns of relationship. Mutation does not render meaningless the systematic classification and description of morphology and physiology. No more need observable socio-economic correlates of voting behavior prejudge the case against the individual's capacity for creative thinking, moral choice, and compassion for his fellow man.

---

* The analysis presented in this article has been developed from a working paper prepared by the author for the Social Science Research Council Committee on Political Behavior. Problems of scope and design for research in the political process have been discussed in the meetings of that Committee and of the New England Committee on Political Behavior Research.

The more stimulating dilemma for political behavior research is the apparent and oft-berated contrast between observable behavior patterns and the heritage of democratic belief. As a discipline, political science has not pushed ahead rapidly with the necessarily arduous business of direct and systematic observation of the phenomena it seeks to describe and analyze. Partly this has been due to the difficulties inherent in the materials themselves. It may be noted that in many disciplines sensible people have centered attention first upon available materials, and that much of the material of political life is by its nature and temperature not readily exposed to the eye of a non-practitioner. More important, however, has been the mistaken tendency to attribute descriptive validity to the normative literature of our culture. This body of political thought has particularly beclouded research in democratic politics because in very large part it antedated the effort to practice democracy in nation states of the industrial era. The perpetuation of these early stereotypes has constantly colored with negative valuations the perceptions of operating behavior that did penetrate the barrier of dogma. Associated with the lag in observation has been the delay in reworking the conceptual scheme of the democratic polity. It is at this point that new insights may now be expected to underpin field research and facilitate the integration of the very rich contributions of other disciplines into a working picture of the political process.

In surveying recent research contributions, the concept that recommends itself presents a picture of the political process as a continuum of interaction patterns between the individual citizen and the tension points of decision-making. The democratic presumption has traditionally focussed too exclusively on those few and sporadic interactions which relate individuals directly to formal government. This has contributed to what may prove to be an exaggerated concern with an iron law of oligarchy, with political apathy, with public ignorance and gullibility. It has led to what may be an undue valuation of the grass roots, the town meeting, devices for direct democracy, and experiments with public enlightenment. It has contributed to both frustration and disillusionment and to a certain utopian reaching for short cuts and political panaceas, a penchant for setting everything to rights by a single device to reconstruct behavior in the image of a rational political philosophy.

In the field of research the preoccupation with direct contacts between individual and formal government has contributed to a notable concentration of effort upon the two poles of the continuum. At one pole the individual citizen has been studied in those few aspects of his life which were conceived as significantly political: his voting behavior, his consumption habits of media of mass communication, his opinions on great issues, his direct participation in organized partisan groups, and, by and large, his apparent apathy and confusion in these respects. At the other pole, political science has given attention to the machinery of central government, to the role of active participants at the strategic points of public policy-making, to oligarchs in action. The concept of the democratic polity that supposes that there is a meaningful continuum of interactions between these poles, and that these patterns of interaction are of a varied and subtle, not always of an overt and clearly "political" character, will help to design research into the intervening processes.

Quite certainly, however, we shall prepare the way for confusion if we suppose that the citizen and the key official are linked by a direct and straight-line series of interactions. Much more probably we are dealing with sets of relationships which, when traced in isolation on a single issue or decision or on the behavior of an individual citizen, will prove to be discontinuous and segmental, spanning only part of the way. It may, further, be suggested that it is precisely the discontinuous, overlapping and limited nature of the series of relationships that distinguishes the democratic polity. The resultant limited liability of our political process may be at once its greatest moral value and its greatest strength. Much more needs to be known about the interlapping series of interaction patterns which relate individual citizen to the making of legally binding decision before moral judgments are made of the political process which has been developed. Clearly one source of confusion has been the rigid application of democratic norms to particular relations seen in isolation.

The political process may, therefore, be conceived and studied in terms of multiple, parallel, collaborating and competing patterns of interaction linking citizen and active participants in key positions of decision-making. Some relations are direct from citizen to official in public or private hierarchies of institutionalized power. Some relations are indirect but constitute a reasonably continuous chain reaction spanning the whole political distance. Many meaningful patterns span only part of the way, from either pole or a segment without readily discernible impact at either pole. These segmental patterns overlap, and condition behavior and relationships in other segments. Much of the time, indeed, the important processes of democratic politics may paradoxically consist of a discontinuous continuum of relationships.

A further step, after preliminary mapping of the relationships and identification of the broad topography of power groupings, must be the exploration of uniformities and variations in the patterns of relationship at different points along the continuum. We may not assume that the patterns, within primary groups or between individual and mass media of communication for example, will prove to be uniform at each pole and at the intervening points along the continuum. For studies in political behavior it will be particularly important to find out what variations characterize the emergence of informal leadership or the techniques and character of that leadership, comparing the small city trade union council, the rural township party committee, the town selectmen with the National Defense Council, the President's Cabinet, the Congressional committee.

Research design is needed not only to encompass this diversity of patterns, but also to admit of the highly fluid and dynamic character of the process. A given individual or organized group must be seen as participating at the same point in time through diverse patterns according to the nature of the matter in hand and the structures of relation that have been developed. Further, research must attempt to reveal the changes in the patterns through time and ultimately to note the conditioning circumstances that precipitate such altered patterns. Political behavior research so defined is limited neither to particular levels of government organization nor to overtly political acts, however broadly conceived. It is concerned with the total pattern of social relations which are involved in relating the citizen to the state at all institutional levels.

II

Of the research which focusses on the full span of what might be called political distance, from individual citizen to institutionalized, public officialdom, the studies of voting behavior have particularly invited an empiricial approach. Voting is seen as a dramatic performance. In a sense, it is central to the normative theory of the democratic polity. Within certain limits of political corruption it is recorded with tolerable fidelity, though not always conveniently for the research worker, who finds that he must ride circuit to county or town to complete his data. In a sense, voting behavior is the pay-off for much political behavior. The rapidly expanding use in political science of the voting studies that have been completed bears witness to the importance of pushing ahead systematically with the work. Many voting behavior studies have been almost accidentally chosen case studies of localities, lacking a principle of selection which might help to place the findings in an interpretative scheme. Other studies have illuminated regional or particular situations more broadly in place or time. Though going beyond pilot studies of method, they still represent only test borings of the political process.

Voting records have been examined methodologically from several different perspectives. Some have sought internal evidence, in the voting record alone, of political tides or cycles which would establish predictable uniformities. Research is now underway to see whether records of participation, the comparison of non-voting ratios, can contribute importantly to our understanding of the citizen's perception of political party and the scope and character of citizenship at different levels of government, national, state, local, of different phases of party, primary and election, and of different responses to party organization in "bossed" or "unbossed" communities. From such evidence, the voter's span of attention may more clearly be understood, and indications may be found as to his sense of his capacity to exercise power across the various ranges of political distance.

Along with such interpretation of voting behavior in itself, there has been a sustained effort to manipulate socio-economic correlates. Traditional voting patterns on a state and regional basis have been related to the economic regions of the country and to the historic patterns of population movement in order to illuminate the long-term strategic equations confronting the major parties. Despite not inconsiderable difficulties of finding homologous and stable geographic units and continuing time series, it has been possible to make exploratory correlations between voting preferences and business cycles, ethnic and religious factors, income strata, education and exposure to mass media of communications. Areas of flexible and inflexible party and factional allegiance have been identified, although interpretative hypotheses of these phenomena are still preliminary. Suggestive political rules of thumb, such as the importance of local origin or ethnic names on the ballot, have been illustrated by statistical studies. Most of these studies point to indispensable basic coverage that remains to be done. For most major geographic regions, there is still lacking a systematic examination of the alignments of principal power groups which would mark out the gross political topography.

The application to campaign and election of the tools of the sample survey, and more especially of the panel survey, has recently opened up new possibilities for understanding voting behavior. It has become possible to make correlations, of a far greater range and with more flexibility, between voting preference and socio-economic characteristics of individuals. The process culminating in voting decisions can be traced through an entire campaign by returning repeatedly to the same panel of respondents. The undecided voter can be identified. The forces contributing to voting decision can be weighed more systematically than with previous research methods and direct approach can be made to discovering the voter's perception of party at different levels. It will be of profound significance to be able more fully to describe the voter's conception of his relation to party, elected official and policy issue.

Promising hypotheses appear in these studies, correlating the undecided or the independent voters with the degree of individual integration into, or isolation from, immediate social environment, and with upward or downward mobility in the social stratification system. With such methodological developments, voting can be conceived and studied not so much as a tenuous, sporadic link between atomized individual and elected officials, but rather as an episode, only occasionally dramatic, in a more structured social situation.

Panel studies in selected communities over periods of time, campaign and inter-campaign, will also make possible a more satisfactory analysis of the impact of political organization. Indices have been devised for comparing the degree and effectiveness of party organization in terms of ratios of voting participation and split-ticket versus straight-ticket voting; but they have rested on necessarily tentative assumptions. Case narratives of political machines have developed an understanding of the techniques whereby politicians make meaningful impacts upon voters. Now systematic studies of behavioral, as well as attitude, facts of a panel of respondents will make explicit the linkage between voter and local political organization which has been so little illuminated in voting behavior studies.

It is necessary to emphasize, however, that research in campaigns, elections and voting behavior must be only one part of a program of research into political behavior. An emphasis on voting as the core of the political process has led to common disillusionment with the democratic polity. Much has been revealed of voter ignorance and apathy, as well as of the impact upon voter decision of forces which appear incompatible with the normative theory of the alert, responsible citizen. Empirical research has not attempted to explore the normatively derived hypothesis that, however determined by identifiable factors the voter's choice may be, the fact of a free vote, or merely the opportunity to vote, nevertheless may have significance in the education and moral development of the individual. Conversely, close attention to the campaign and election obscures the role of voting in disciplining the individuals, elective and non-elective, at key points of government. By focussing on one pole of the continuum, and on the time frame of an election, it is difficult to see in perspective the vote as contingent sanction on the insiders in the political process. Occasional, passive, uninformed, traditional, emotional or largely negative though the vote may be, the hypothesis must be expanded to see the vote in relation to the political process along the full continuum; but voting behavior studies have seldom been designed to place the vote in this larger political context.

Finally, the vote is not the only, nor perhaps even the primary, political choice made by the citizen. Appleby's descriptive analysis of the vote is a valuable stimulus to further research design. "Citizens vote by adding their names and energies to membership rolls. They vote by swelling, or failing to swell, the circulations of particular newspapers or periodicals. They vote by contributing to the popularity of particular radio or newspaper commentators. They vote by writing 'letters to the editor.' They vote much more potently than they know when they write or talk to members of legislative bodies and to administrative officials. They vote as they express themselves in labor unions, farm organizations, business and professional bodies. They vote in every contribution they make to the climate of opinion in a thoroughly political society. They vote more effectively still as they organize to exert influence. They vote effectively in proportion to the persistence of their efforts, for persistence is an index to intensity of feeling. . . . A society rich in political processes achieves the logic of a social calculus beyond the scope of simpler, more 'rational' processes. Only politics can equate multiple, unlike variables of reason and emotion, of situation and time."[1]

III

A second broad category of research which seeks to explore the wide gap between citizen and major public policy is the rapidly expanding work in communications and public opinion. The development of techniques for quantification, the practical application of many attitude and opinion findings, and the facility with which results can be communicated to a general audience, all have contributed to an enthusiastic use of these research skills. It is particularly important to note that the pitfalls in this area lie not so much in the perfecting of the tool as in the design of the question. Because the tool was available, quantification convincing, and result marketable, there has been at times a measuring of opinion that can hardly be supposed to have existed or been meaningful in the terms verbally elicited. This has had dyslogistic implications of deep significance for the democratic polity. To a degree this outcome has been related directly to an inarticulate premise that the democratic political process consists primarily of direct relations between citizen and major policy formation, and that opinion should be rational and specific and generally held. Ironically, the penchant for framing questions about the issues of great public policy, where commonly enough the citizen has a minimum knowledge of experience, a minimum opportunity for direct behavior and a maximum of value-loaded stereotypes, may have contributed to a redesigned concept of the political process. Eliciting opinion from the rank and file on issues that defied such simple resolution even by the especially informed and responsible, the pollsters drew wide attention to the inadequacy of a political presumption resting too exclusively upon direct linkages between the poles of the continuum.

---

[1] Paul H. Appleby, *Policy and Administration* (University, Alabama, 1949), p. 168.

The experience with cross sectional samples and various interview techniques has served and will serve many purposes in examining strategic points in the continuum of political interaction, in addition to the recording of citizen opinion on the great issues of the moment. Extension of the method has taken place, with the goal of understanding not merely the verbal opinion, but also the frame of reference used by sample respondents. This concern with the citizen's cognitive structure is a step toward encompassing in the research design the complex stream of cultural patterns of which the verbalized opinion may be only the surface chop. Political science, concerned as it has been with normative theory and the historical and philosophic elaboration of that theory, may be able to cooperate effectively now both in question design and interpretation of responses. As commonly recognized, the framing of questions in opinion research conditions importantly the responses elicited. Much questioning has been directed to immediate great issues and in terms of a "realistic" conception of human values and purposes, stressing income, deference and safety. Opinion research into the citizen's frame of reference may gain by exploring several levels of values, idealistic and rationalistic, professed and readily verbalized, or operational in terms of current behavior. A familiarity with the internal contradictions of the cultural heritage can place in context the verbal opinion responses and, more importantly, can place in perspective the task of interpreting the frame of reference used by the respondent. The relations between these modes of discourse in regard to values is illuminated by familiarity with the contraditions in normative theories, whether the root cause of such contradictions be conceived as cultural lag, conflict of personality in culture, chronological accidents of Western intellectual history, or the peculiar aberrations of our particular society.

The study of communication and opinion is seeking in new hypotheses the determinants of opinion and attitude. Much remains to be done in relating content analysis of the media of mass communication with opinion formation. There is still lacking conclusive work in the relation between content and institutional control of the principal media. Enough dramatic evidence has been turned up to disaffect research from any premise of a one-to-one relation between a closely controlled content and the resultant in opinion. Significant relationships are now being sought in interaction patterns more segmental and more numerous than earlier postulated. Cross sectional samples can uncover the relevance to opinion of group affiliation, homogeneous as compared with cross-pressured memberships, special and attentive publics, roles as rank and file members or as leaders in group or local community. Exploratory cross sectional samples can be followed up with purposive samples of élites, the involved and the rank and file, to discover differences in sources of information, frames of reference and degree of involvement.

Recent hypotheses about leaders who mold opinion in informal, face-to-face situations and about the role of attentive publics promise to modify in a significant and most encouraging fashion the stereotyped concept that public opinion resides in rank and file citizenry and somehow, by its rightness and its power, determines public policy or, conversely, by its malleability and its ignorance, leaves power in the hands of the oligarchs of propaganda and demagoguery. It remains to explore these hypotheses in varied contexts, in order to determine what relations may exist between opinion leadership and status in group or class. In what terms and to what degree are attentive publics homogeneous? Over what range of time or issue do awareness and involvement carry the members of an attentive public? What is the consequence of varying proportions of élite, attentive and non-involved?

Conceivably, also, sample survey techniques will yield materials of increasing importance to the interpretation of political behavior as the criteria for constructing quota samples or the designating of sub-universes for analyzing responses become more directly relevant to the patterns of interaction with which the research is dealing. The available census classifications by age, sex, income and education may well be less telling than group affiliation, residence, geographic mobility or, if such were manageable, personality type.

In the study of communications and opinion as in the study of voting behavior, development has been toward a conceptual scheme filling in the unreal gap initially pictured between citizen and state, a gap which was conceptually bridged by tenuous threads of the printed word, the electronic noise and the vote. Current research directs attention to meaningful segmental relationships which are at present the starting points for further verification and exploration.

IV

Studies in the nature of leadership constitute a third category of observations commonly stressing the full span of the continuum. There is an immemorial tradition of writing political history with a hero orientation. Political biography is an important part of the literary heritage and rich in insights and political experience. The classical tradition of political philosophy built its classification around ruling classes, élites and a concept of cyclical and secular change in terms of rotation or displacement of political leaders.

For systematic research, however, much of this work must always remain a source of hypotheses and not a resource of data. Though rich in case material, little can be done to make the cases comparable and additive. Methodologically, leadership studies have illustrated the limitations of the uncontrolled case approach. With increasing subtlety of understanding of the particular, one may become committed to an orientation of uniqueness. Conversely, however, so long as new insights, new variables and new relationships can be seen through unsystematic examination of the unique, it would be a mistake to restrict political behavior research to system, rigor and quantification, in the false illusion that this alone is science.

At one pole of the continuum, there has been a renewed focus on the leader as individual, using biography as method, with psychoanalytical categories and hypotheses. There have been classification schemes of motive, emphasizing the Realpolitik of power rewards, and there have been enumerations of the skills of power seekers in terms such as violence, organization, propaganda. The personality-type classification of psychoanalytical work still lacks something in precision and in fact explains too little, not yet much beyond a description of the individual's behavior. Most anal, compulsive neurotics do not become effective political leaders, nor do leaders appear consistently to have disturbed personalities of definable categories. Less compulsive and more flexible typologies have still to be applied systematically to political leadership. Work in this area has been stimulated by what appears to be the personal pathology of certain totalitarian leadership and has clarified in only a limited degree the relationships on the continuum of the democratic polity.

It remains notably true that only scattered studies have been made seeking to classify leadership in more pedestrian but more readily definable terms, such as career data, income, vocation, education, and geographic and social mobility. There are preliminary studies of the channels by which men reach positions of political leadership. Though ultimately less meaningful, perhaps, than a workable personality typology, systematic classification of socio-economic and life history data will explain much about the leader in the political process; and a more inclusive picture of the ladders of leader mobility may help to identify relationship patterns obscured by focus on a direct line from leader to citizen.

Political science has an increasing body of impressionistically additive case studies of the horizontal as well as the vertical patterns of individual interaction at the leader pole of the continuum. Studies in the anatomy and chronology of decision-making have increased the descriptive material available and placed individual leaders in context, though only in the partial context of the inter-relations among the active insiders close to great public policy. Both case studies of public administration developed for teaching purposes and more extensive monographic materials have tended to emphasize an interpersonal and an interagency syndrome, with special attention to the tensions of executive-legislative relations under the separation of powers. Below this high policy level, however, despite responsible case studies and somewhat irresponsible muckraking, there is very little data on what a politician does at points along the continuum. These facts are, by their nature, not available in any archives. The compulsions of normative theory and at times, no doubt, the criminal law conspire to keep them as ephemeral as possible. The scholar has had difficulty in gaining access as participant observer and in remaining a disciplined, objective recorder when he was himself turned amateur activist.

Much remains to be done with readily available materials. Data must be gathered and compared in order to describe adequately the procedures of nominations and primaries. What variations exist in the sponsoring of candidates by party organization? To what extent and under what circumstances are primaries contested? What conditions lead to an individual's becoming a candidate? How widespread is raiding of the opposition primary? Such information on the "middle management" level of the partisan political process has so far been recorded largely in terms of public law and only haphazardly in terms of practices. Like much of the voting behavior analysis, the design and tools of research pose relatively minor obstacles and a large inventory of work remains to be done. Like many of the other basic, descriptive jobs, this may be undertaken more systematically as the enterprise is seen in terms of the total agenda for studying the political process.

More difficult in method, but with reasonably accessible materials, would be a series of studies of campaign situations, which would seek to join psychological insights into the personality of the candidate with the issues of the particular episode and the socio-economic and traditional voting characteristics of the constituency. Increasingly research speculation turns toward an analysis of leadership in terms of communication, the process of acquiring representativeness and the two-way flow of relationships involved in the spanning of vast political distance between leader and rank and file citizen. As attention is turned to individual leader in context, the problem of research becomes less one of describing a direct spanning and more one of developing an understanding of leader in situation and episode, as proved also to be the case in discussing the political behavior of the individual citizen.

Studies of representation and the legislative process involve a considerable segment of the continuum, though by no means as great as that between rank and file and the great figures of charismatic or institutional leadership. Here again there is need to complete the preliminary spade work involved in comparative studies of tenure, socio-economic characteristics and career sequences. Pilot studies have been attempted correlating legislative roll calls with the demographic characteristics of the constituencies to assist in a gross topography of power alignments. More of such studies will also help to describe persistent attitudes and policy commitments in different constituencies and more specifically to understand the nature of, and permutations in, the relationship of representation. Little systematic data is available in this area. Further work is needed to observe the flow of communication from constituency to legislator and the pattern of response to these multiple pressures, together with a broad gauge field study of the constituency itself, its economy, social stratification, group organization, media of communication and party organization, in order to record simultaneously the circumstances originating this flow of communication. In this way the multiple roles of the representative may be illuminated and judgments made in regard to our contradictory and normatively colored hypotheses of representation. A valuable complement to this approach would be a close recording and analysis of the contacts, interactions and experiences of the newly-elected, first-term legislator to see how the political and social environment at the capital conditions the perceptions and role of the representative.

A concern with leadership points also to relationships across a far narrower span, and here some interesting tools are available for students of political behavior. The leader as great figure, dramatic individual, spanning the gulf from high policy to bewildered individual, is a part of the democratic polity; but it is of more than passing importance, both in normative theory of democracy and in terms of a non-normative concept of the political process, to describe the leadership relations along the continuum. This is, again, the problem of seeing the process in sufficiently comprehensive terms that go back to the rank and file individual, the local situation, the primary group, and of seeing the pattern and significance of leadership at many levels.

Difficulties of identifying significant intermediate leader-follower relations have hitherto been a factor in discouraging research. By quantifying the interactions between individuals in an organized or an informal group and by tabulating the direction and character of initiation and response, it is possible to develop an objective, verifiable picture of informal leadership in face-to-face situations. It is also possible to trace, with reasonable rigor, the patterns of influence and leadership in politico-administrative relations of community life. Following out the daily routines and participations as well as the attitude responses of a sample panel of citizens, we are led to increased understanding of men influential in their community and molders of its opinion. Such studies have, so far, reinforced a picture of American society as a complex of parallel, competing and vertically discontinuous power structures, a concept which is disorderly but not uncongenial to democratic premises. Preliminary research indicates that people turn to different leaders for different policy areas within the community. It indicates again the essential phenomenon that individuals are guilty of remarkably little behavior which is strictly "political" in the sense of directly related to the legal institutions of government.

Further research is needed to trace the paths of influence from primary group through successive levels of interaction, and to place the resulting pattern in relation to the status system in order to explore systematically the premises of class and pressure group analysis which have tended to dominate the conceptual schemes of political science. Research so far has given only preliminary intimations of a relation between successive levels of influentials, between these and the overall stratification of the social system, and a possible chain relation linking these levels. It is with concepts of this nature that political behavior research may be able to escape the normatively imposed frustrations about apathy and begin to describe the political process. It is this very description that has been lacking and that has led to such varied and gloomy abstractions about our political behavior, and to such limited and yet exaggerated concepts of leadership. Along with this description, the marking out of the sequences and patterns of leader-follower relations, may come a comparison of these relations on the basis of the extent of political distance spanned and the situation within which the relation is articulated. Until we can see in more orderly fashion the multiplicity and variety of leadership situations with which we are concerned, it is difficult to speculate about the factors conditioning the techniques and the role of leadership in the political process.

V

A review of research in voting behavior, communications, opinion and leadership points to the necessity for filling in and elaborating our concept of the linkages between individual and public policy-making. In this endeavor political science has concentrated on the organized interest group. The concept of group has been variously used by the social sciences, with meanings as diverse as class or racial minorities, nationally federated vocational and professional associations, the primary group or committee or informal discussion group. Political science has emphasized the organized pressure groups and many studies have in effect conceived of these, together with party, as the most important if not the exclusive, intermediary patterns of political behavior establishing relations between individual and government. Inventory has been taken of groups and pressure techniques on legislature and administration from the perspective of a single policy issue, of a particular public agency or of a single organized group. Isolated studies have also been made of the political process within groups. Thought of at the time as pilot operations, these case studies have not been followed up in the orderly fashion which the case method would require to establish verified uniformities. In part this has been because of a lack of research opportunity and resources, but, in addition, the inarticulateness of the overall conceptual scheme of the political process encouraged the feeling that the terrain had been explored by exposing a few groups, legislatures and administrative agencies to animadversion and contumely in the light of normative democratic theory. There has been a good deal of muckraking in pressure politics studies.

For an orderly exploration of these essential segments of the continuum, a series of comparative studies is needed to establish the patterns of intra-group processes. Trade unions, great business corporations, professional associations, trade associations and civic and reform groups present widely varying practices in regard to the role of the active minority, the formal officialdom, rank and file members, the discipline of members and group sanctions. Political science has borrowed from business experience in studying administrative rather than political behavior. Intensive work is now underway in selected trade unions. Two perspectives are evident in such work. As interactions in series between individual and government institutions, the internal life of organized groups is a preëminently important segment. It is also possible to conceive of internal group politics as a manageable microcosm of the great society, available for systematic comparative study. Without much richer case materials it is not possible to verify this latter assumption, nor can we yet establish the degree of uniformity or diversity to be found in groups of different size, purpose and degree of tension.

The small, face-to-face group can now be closely analyzed by quantifying the frequency and type of personal interactions. Preliminary typologies were at one time attempted to distinguish democratic, authoritarian and laisser faire groups. Other investigators have preferred less normative implications, and sought uniformities in terms of an economy of opportunity and a harmonic principle producing recurring patterns of group leadership and member participation. It is not now possible to project the techniques, developed for studying the primary group, to the large group with which political science has commonly been concerned. The findings are, nevertheless, crucial to an understanding of a political process linked together at key points by party committees, legislative committees, administrative staffs, interdepartmental committees and executive committees within large groups. It remains to be seen whether primary group processes are uniform or homologous at different points along the continuum from Republican town committee and P.T.A. meeting to the Presidential Cabinet.

Intergroup relations beg for study from two vantage points. Political science materials already have inventoried pressures on public bodies and have traced the mobilization of groups with reference to particular great issues. To understand the role of organized groups in relation to political parties and public policy, the pattern of intergroup relations must be recorded through time and on a series of issues. On what areas of policy do the principal organized groups cooperate, compete, remain neutral but alert, fail to be aware of the issue? Is there a consistent pattern of cooperation and competition? What is the role of the catalytic or the ad hoc group? Are there uniformities in the configuration of intergroup alignments that determine the fate of policy proposals? Studies of this type will verify an increasing body of speculation about the respective roles of party, pressure group, public opinion, elective chief executive and voter. Generalization is now made on the basis of isolated and dramatic episodes; working patterns can be established only by keeping a selected arena under scrutiny for a period of time, with attention alike to the great moral issues and the more routine occasions of mutual accommodation that make organized society possible.

The second vantage point for the study of intergroup relations is the rank and file individual member of many organized groups. There has been normative rather than empirical analysis of the meaning for the individual of multiple affiliations of varying intensity and of real or potential conflict. Focus on the individual in many groups will be a valuable complement to the political scientist's emphasis on the group itself as unit in the political equation, an approach which at times has seemed to over-abstract and reify the group. Attitude surveys have begun the work of recording the relative intensity of the individual's sense of affiliation, especially in what are conceived to be particularly cross-pressured situations. The cross sectional sample survey serves to identify the individual's group memberships, as well as his rank and file and leadership roles. Such research can develop more fully the frame of reference with which the individual perceives his group memberships and the purposes of his groups. Tests can be made of the conflicts and loyalties which seem crucial to sample respondents. Purposive samples can reveal diversity and correspondence of policy preferences and frames of reference between group officials, active minority, and rank and file. It is not certain, however, that quantification of verbalized attitudes will serve as a conclusive method for studying the meaning of group to individual, even with the refinements of his cognitive structure. Asking at what point or on what terms the individual will act, to the disadvantage of other affiliations in his life, for a group, a cause, an ideal, may be stretching the respondent's capacity for hypothetical speculation. Systematic research into the role of individuals in groups must join attitude with behavioral facts of group participation and discipline in situations of varying tension. Ultimately at issue, of course, is the character of constitutional morality, the individual's commitment not only to diverse group purposes but also to the political process itself.

VI

Little has been done in political behavior research with relationships which are not readily seen as a chain reaction or pattern of interaction in series across the continuum.

In politics, administration and research the effort has been rather to construct or conceptualize idealized patterns, as in the efforts to elicit grass roots response to administration and to educate the voter to civic duty. The orientation of research to the clearly visible relations in series is perhaps just as well, since it would not be profitable to ride off in all directions in the search for relevancies. Nevertheless, the conceptual scheme will be deceptively simple and narrow if it excludes segmental interaction patterns which are not directly in straight line series across the continuum, but which condition importantly other relations perceived as in the main stream of the political process. An example, and an ironic one, is the study of class and social stratification, which has recently proceeded substantially out of the frame of reference of political science. Yet class has been a central and perhaps the most persistent conceptual scheme in political theory. In operating terms, the status system of a local community may be presumed to condition the patterns of interest group membership, organisation and leadership, the interactions of groups, the practices of party organisation and the myths and symbols of opinion mobilization.

Techniques have been developed for empirical research in the status system, using either the judgments of sample panels of raters in the community or membership and participation in family, clique or association, which are in turn rated by a panel. Indices of status have been devised, rating by observable socio-economic factors such as occupation, income, income source, residence area and education. Categories have also been built from subjective classifications or attitude responses of cross section samples. Much of the research has been colored by relatively inarticulate premises that stratification is evil and on the increase. Only the most impressionistic evidence has been adduced that social stratification is increasing either in social distance between the ends of the scale, in proportions at either end, or in feelings of hostility or tension along the scale. For political process research a sophisticated morphology alone is inadequate, however provocative. Physiology and evolution must be introduced into the equations. Greater emphasis is needed on quantification of the frequency and range of interclass mobility.

Even more important is the design of research to relate stratification to the continuum of the political process. What does social status mean in terms of the overtly political interactions? Studies of status have often reported in anecdotal form that the upper class keeps out of "politics," but uses the ambitious, upward mobile, upper middles as surrogates through whom the uppers manipulate the entire economic and political framework of the community. The hypothesis touches so closely the central questions as to deserve closer observation. It has an appealing logic and in many situations it has intuitively the right feel. But quite possibly the proposition is a misconception, a product of Marxian dialectic or of the visual stereotypes of power and income distribution as narrowly peaked pyramids, which are presumed to be reciprocal images of each other and in which there is conceived to be a downward flow of influence. There is need for caution in conceiving of leadership or power as flow, certainly as uni-directional flow. The concept of inter-class political dominance and subordination requires systematic examination to map the working relationships which can in fact be found to carry across from social status to the patterns of the political continuum. There may in fact be parallel systems of relationship, of which social rating is only one, conditioning to a degree the interactions in other patterns, but not carrying across to economic and political relationships an overall dominance and subordination.

The study of status has often conceived the community as static and isolated. Even in terms of social strata alone, the studies have lacked a sense of the relative scales operating in village and small city as part of metropolitan community and national scene. Social strata must be linked to observations of opinion leadership, overtly political roles, intergroup configuration and the patterns of interaction at key tension points in the political process. A substantial body of data on the status system is at hand for use in political process research.

VII

These illustrations of research design, at what now appear as particularly revealing points along the continuum and which lend themselves to examination by tools presently available, may serve to clarify the suggested conceptual scheme. The enumeration of research problems and tools emphasizes that political behavior research is not the business of a single social science discipline. Incestuous insemination of otherwise barren sister disciplines has already become the commonplace of political behavior research and need not be artificially contrived.

Recognizable pitfalls lie along the way of research in political behavior. Normative theory cannot profitably be applied in rigid measurement of each element in the pattern of relations. Indeed, the compulsion to do so has led to disillusionment. Present inability to describe and explain the total pattern colors emotionally much of the research in progress and its reception by both lay and professional publics. Yet normative theory, as earlier noted, has an indispensable role in empirical research. Values are data of political process. They very properly set priorities for research. The heritage of political philosophy will prove to be a source of hypotheses for research, and our political values will guide the use of research findings. These appropriate uses of normative theory have been peculiarly difficult to delimit, partly because of the origins of political science in history, philosophy and public law, but even more because the materials of political behavior research are continuously charged with programmatic potential in a society that largely seeks social reform through government action. Research people are not always immune to the refracting effect of their own program commitments or of their peculiar social role as intellectuals in what they have sometimes called a business civilization.

There are difficulties arising from the intracultural and the intranational character of the data being processed. The gross phenomena of interest in political behavior are not subject to controlled experiment, and seldom enough to close comparative analysis. Yet it would be a mistake for political science, in an enthusiasm for rigorous tools, focussing for the most part on individual behavior and attitude, to read itself out of the perspectives of historical evidence or cross-national comparisons. Cross-national and cross-cultural data alert research to the existence of variables and to ranges of variation otherwise ignored. Area studies programs may well fructify political behavior research in this respect. Against these possibilities, of course, must be weighed the evident difficulties of making rigorous analyses with the greatly expanded complexity of variables at once introduced by reaching beyond the single national community. But with a broader perspective of the political process, the earlier concern of political science with comparative institutions may more profitably be reconsidered. The legal framework is one basic element in the equation, and one in which the political scientist has familiarity. Institutional diversity within the American political scene is actually rather closely circumscribed. Historical and comparative studies can contribute insights into the dimension of the institutional factor in the political process.

Research in the political process profits from a reasonable humility. There is an inclination in social science to borrow from the physical sciences a sense of great accomplishment lying just over the horizon of systematic empirical work. Research in this area has and will have social engineering implications of immediate and real significance. It will not, even with enough research money, produce peace, permanent prosperity, a model democracy, or fully adjusted citizens. Description will remain segmental, accurate prediction elusive. It is evident, however, that more appropriate hypotheses and more complete description can contribute fundamentally to the operation of, and to confidence in, the modern democratic polity.

A program of research in the political process must remain eclectic. No single strategy or model recommends itself from a survey of the tools available or the hypotheses adumbrated. Among the many possibilities, three broad categories of research design may be noted as mutually reinforcing. First, along the continuum of the political process between citizen and active oligarch, the interaction patterns must in many cases still be discovered, as well as described more completely. The diversity of these patterns is important to a working conceptual scheme, including the direct spanning between national leader or issue and rank and file individual, the segmental chain reaction patterns of greatly varying extent of political distance, and the segmental interlapping patterns where there is in effect the paradox of a discontinuous continuum. The limitation of this research plan is that it will see such patterns of interaction in isolation, will become absorbed in each for its own sake, will miss their interrelations, will be unable to assign their appropriate weight. There is the tendency to make each newly identified pattern of interaction explain too much, to try it on for fit at every point in the continuum, in every policy area and in every situation in time.

A second approach to research design examines the process in action through time, with reference to a major policy issue. By tracing back or forward the processes involved in the formation of a public policy, the interaction patterns are brought to the attention of the investigator and are seen in working relation to each other. For all its current appeal for political science, this technique runs the very considerable risk of missing those patterns which do not develop in series over the whole continuum. Starting at the key tension points of final policy resolution, research will note only what more or less directly impinges on that level of politics or what is mobilized by that issue.

A third strategic design is the intensive study of selected communities over a period of time. Beginning with the cross section sample of respondents, their primary groups, the patterns of their formal and informal relationships, the status system, group affiliations, intergroup relations and tensions and media of communication in a single community, it is possible to bring under observation the many segmental and interlapping relations which will escape detection if a radioactive tracer is introduced from the point of major policy decision. By staying with a community over a period of several years, alternative patterns and the range of variation in context become noticeable. The element of time is important in developing intuitive judgment of factors not initially subjected to rigorous observation or quantification. It becomes possible to explore hypotheses emerging from the data. Research in the political process will prosper most rapidly as it encourages those insights which develop with the data and with clinical experience of the total context. A program of research in the political process includes such major strategic approaches pursued in conjunction.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW IN 1949–1950

ROBERT J. HARRIS
Louisiana State University

There were two changes in the personnel of the Supreme Court during the 1949 term. Attorney General Tom C. Clark was sworn in as an Associate Justice to succeed the late Justice Frank Murphy on August 24, 1949, after his nomination by President Truman had been approved on August 19 by a vote of 73 to 8. Judge Sherman Minton of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals was nominated to be an Associate Justice on September 15, 1949, to succeed Justice Wiley Rutledge. His nomination was approved by the Senate on October 4 by a vote of 48 to 16, and he was sworn in on October 12. During much of the term Justice Douglas was absent as the result of an accident incurred during the preceding summer recess. The loss of Justices Murphy and Rutledge greatly weakened the liberal alignment of the Court and very positively influenced the decision of a number of doubtful cases contrary to precedents of a recent date.

A. QUESTIONS OF NATIONAL POWER

1. INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

The most important commerce case decided in the 1949 term was *American Communications Association v. Douds*[1] where, with its companion case of *Osman v. Douds*,[2] the Court sustained the validity of the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act of 1947, which withdrew the privileges of the National Labor Relations Act from those unions whose officials fail to sign affidavits to the effect that they are not members of, or affiliated with, the Communist Party and that they "do not believe in" and are not members or supporters of any organization that teaches the overthrow of the government of the United States by violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional means. In an opinion by Chief Justice Vinson, the Court reasoned that the power to regulate commerce includes the power to protect commerce against political strikes and other direct action designed to interrupt its free flow. Political affiliations of the kind involved here no less than business affiliations were regarded as providing a rational ground for the legislative judgment that Communists and believers in the overthrow of government by violence would be tempted to commit acts harmful to the national economy by conducting disruptive political strikes as leaders of unions. These cases also involved questions of freedom of thought and speech around which both the majority and dissenting opinions were primarily centered. Later mention will be made of these issues.

Except for these holdings, few cases involving issues other than statutory interpretation arose under the commerce clause. In *Secretary of Agriculture v. Central Roig Refining Co.*,[3] the Court, speaking through Justice Frankfurter, sustained the orders issued by the Secretary of Agriculture under the Sugar

---

[1] 339 U. S. 382 (1950).

[2] 339 U. S. 846 (1950).

[3] 338 U. S. 604 (1950).

Act of 1948 allocating import quotas to sugar refiners as a lawful regulation of foreign commerce. The commerce clause was held to impose no requirements of geographic uniformity. Though admitting that the commerce power is limited by the due process clause of the Fifth Amendment, Justice Frankfurter could find no denial of due process. He further declared that it would be "a singular intrusion of the judiciary to extrapolate restrictions upon the formulation of such an economic policy from those deeply rooted notions of justice which the Due Process Clause expresses." Final judgment in such matters, he continued, was likely to be "a hodge-podge of considerations" which might weigh with legislators but which the Court could hardly disentangle, because it "is not a tribunal for relief from the crudities and inequities of complicated economic legislation," even though hardships may ensue. Justice Black dissented on the basis of the interpretation of the statute.

By a *per curiam* opinion the court sustained a rate order of the Interstate Commerce Commission which affected a transportation company operating entirely within the District of Columbia in *United States v. Capital Transit Co.*,[4] on the ground that the company's transportation of passengers constituted an integral part of an interstate movement. Chief Justice Vinson, joined by Justices Reed and Jackson, dissented on the basis of the interpretation given the Motor Carrier Act. The Court reached a similar result in *Federal Power Commission v. East Ohio Gas Co.*[5] It held that the National Gas Act applied to a gas company doing business solely within Ohio and selling no gas for resale, on the ground that interstate lines connected with the company's high pressure lines within Ohio so that there was a continuous flow of natural gas in interstate commerce which did not cease when the gas reached Ohio. The orders of the Federal Power Commission regarding accounting and reports were also sustained as being no violations of the due process clause of the Fifth Amendment or of the Tenth Amendment. Justices Jackson and Frankfurter dissented on grounds of statutory interpretation.

2. THE WAR POWER

Military trials. Issues involving the war power and military trials were presented by *Hiatt v. Brown*[6] and *Johnson v. Eisentrager*.[7] In the former case a murder conviction in a court-martial proceeding was sustained over contentions that errors were committed and that the law member of the court-martial was incompetent, on the ground that the civil courts have no supervisory power over proceedings of court martial and on the basis of the rule of *Humphrey v. Smith*[8] that the "single inquiry, the test, is jurisdiction." Justice Burton concurred in the result and thereby prevented complete unanimity. In the second case the Court held that German nationals who had been convicted by an American military commission of military activities in China against the United States, after the surrender of Germany in 1945, had no right to test the validity of their conviction and detention by means of the writ of *habeas corpus*, since such a remedy is not available to resident aliens. Justice Jackson went on to reaffirm the rule of *Ex parte Yamashita*[9] to the effect that if "military tribunals have lawful authority to hear, decide, and condemn, their action is not subject to judicial review merely because they have made a wrong decision on disputed facts."[10] This evoked a dissent from Justice Black, who was joined by Justices Douglas and Burton. The dissenters argued that the Constitution is not wholly inapplicable to occupied territory and that it does not leave "the administration of criminal laws to executive and military agencies completely free from judicial scrutiny." Except for changes in the personnel of the Court, this decision could easily have been in line with these dissenting views.

---

[4] 338 U. S. 286 (1949).

[5] 338 U. S. 464 (1950).

[6] 339 U. S. 103 (1950).

[7] 339 U. S. 763 (1950).

[8] 336 U. S. 695 (1949).

3. THE POWER OF CONGRESS TO INVESTIGATE

Contempt of Congress. By 1950 the seeds sown by the House Committee on Un-American Activities were producing constitutional fruit. *United States v. Bryan*[11] in effect reversed *Christoffel v. United States*[12] by the ruling that the Government is not required to prove the presence of a quorum of the Un-American Activities Committee when the person summoned has appeared but failed to produce the records demanded. Chief Justice Vinson held the Christoffel ruling inapplicable on the ground that the perjury statute involved in that case required the presence of competent tribunal when a false statement was made, whereas the statute governing contempt of Congress contained no such requirement. This obvious misconstruction of the Christoffel case did not satisfy Justice Jackson, who in concurring regarded the cases as identical, and urged the forthright reversal of the Christoffel rule before it should become "embedded in the law as a misleading influence." Justice Black, joined by Justice Frankfurter, dissented on statutory grounds from that portion of the decision which held that the statutory provision prohibiting the use of testimony before Congressional committees, except in cases of perjury, did not preclude the use of testimony given in wilful default to produce records.

In the companion case of *United States v. Fleischman*[13] the Court not only reiterated this interpretation of the statute punishing contempt of Congress, but went far beyond the Bryan case. It held that a member of a board of directors of an organization under scrutiny could be convicted of contempt for failure to produce records not in her possession, in the absence of proof that she endeavored in good faith to bring about compliance with a subpoena. This conclusion proceeded upon the expressed assumption that, when one accepts a position of joint responsibility on a governing board in which compliance with a lawful order requires joint action, he assumes a personal responsibility to act within his power to bring about compliance. Otherwise, contended the Chief Justice, such organizations would be immunized against legislative or judicial commands. Justices Black and Frankfurter in persuasive opinions again dissented on grounds of insufficient evidence, the existence of power to punish refusal to produce papers only when the witness had the power to produce them, and the Court's ignoring the jury charge to the effect that Fleischman could be found guilty only if she had acted in concert with other members to prevent production of papers. Justices Douglas and Clark did not participate. Here again it may be surmised that the result might have been different but for changes in the Court's membership and the absence of Justice Douglas.

---

[9] 327 U. S. 1, 8 (1946).

[10] *Ibid.*

[11] 339 U. S. 323 (1950).

[12] 338 U. S. 84 (1949).

[13] 339 U. S. 349 (1950).

4. FEDERAL JUDICIAL POWER

On the authority of earlier decisions,[14] the Court ruled in *South v. Peters*[15] that the validity of the Georgia county-unit vote system for nominating candidates in primary elections is a political question. Justices Black and Douglas dissented on the ground that the electoral scheme denied equal protection of the laws to the voters in the more populous counties. The Court continued to apply strictly its rules restricting judicial review by refusing unanimously in *Parker v. Los Angeles County*[16] to decide the constitutionality of a county's loyalty program on the grounds that the issues, while pending in state courts, were not ripe for adjudication, and that constitutional questions should not be entertained "in advance of the strictest necessity." The Court also pursued a narrow theory of judicial review of administrative action in *Slocum v. Delaware, L. & W.R. Co.*[17] Here it was held that neither federal nor state courts could invade the exclusive jurisdiction of the National Railway Adjustment Board to adjust disputes between unions and the railroads concerning the scope of their bargaining agreements, by interpreting such agreements. Justice Reed dissented on statutory grounds.

Darr v. Burford[18] produced an anomalous procedural result involving the use of the writ of *habeas corpus* to test the validity of a conviction in a state court. Here a bare majority of the Court, for reasons on which only three members could agree in full, extended the familiar rule that exhaustion of state remedies is a prerequisite for *habeas corpus* relief in the federal courts so as to include a petition for certiorari to the federal Supreme Court. This decision in effect overruled *Wade v. Mayo*[19] and restored an earlier ruling. Justices Burton and Clark concurred in the result, and Justice Douglas did not participate in the decision. Justice Frankfurter dissented in an informative opinion in which Justices Black and Jackson joined. The dissenting justices forecast that in the practical operation of the rule applicants would be forced to petition for certiorari and that it would probably be denied without what the Court calls prejudice to *habeas corpus* relief in the proper federal district court, thereby "leaving it to the District Courts to lift the fog [of state procedural law] after we have concluded that it is too thick for us to pierce." Justice Frankfurter would permit immediate recourse to the district courts for such relief after the exhaustion of state remedies. A different phase of judicial power was presented by *Brown v. Western Railway Co. of Alabama,*[20] which dealt with the converse of the Tompkins rule[21] in that it involved the application of the Federal Employers' Liability Act in a state court. Justice Black held for the majority that the Georgia rule of practice to construe pleading allegations "most strictly against the pleader" could not be utilized to defeat federal rights. Justice Frankfurter, in a dissent in which Justice Jackson concurred, contended that the principles of the Tompkins rule should have been applied and that a litigant having a choice of forums chose the practice of the forum when he chose the court.

---

[14] *McDougall v. Green*, 335 U. S. 281 (1948), *Colegrove v. Green*, 328 U. S. 549 (1946), and *Wood v. Broom*, 287 U. S. 1 (1932).

[15] 339 U. S. 276 (1950).

[16] 338 U. S. 327 (1949).

[17] 339 U. S. 239 (1950).

[18] 339 U. S. 200 (1950).

[19] 334 U. S. 672 (1948). This case was decided by a five to four vote and was contrary to the earlier rule of *Ex parte Hawk*, 321 U. S. 114, 116–117 (1944), which had identified appeals and certiorari to the Supreme Court with state remedies.

5. FEDERAL BILL OF RIGHTS

Freedom of speech and opinion. The most important case involving freedom of speech and opinion, and one of the more important cases decided during the 1949 term, was *American Communications Association v. Douds,*[22] which sustained the validity of those provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act requiring anti-Communist affidavits of labor union officials as a condition to their unions' receiving the protection of the National Labor Relations Act. As noted earlier, these provisions were sustained as a valid regulation of commerce against contentions that they violated freedom of speech and opinion. In answer to objections that no "clear and present danger" warranted the controls imposed, Chief Justice Vinson declared that "clear and present danger" is not a mechanical test, and that the considerations which gave rise to this phrase rather than the phrase itself are vital to decisions of issues involving the First Amendment. Proceeding, then, upon the assumption that the survival of the freedoms of the First Amendment depend upon the survival of constitutional government, which has, as it must have, the power to protect itself against unlawful conduct, including in some instances incitements to commit unlawful acts, the Chief Justice interpreted the "clear and present danger" rule as meaning that "Only therefore when force is very likely to follow an utterance before there is a chance for counter-argument to have effect may that utterance be punished or prevented." Hence, freedom of speech can be curtailed only when "views are no longer merely views but threaten, clearly and imminently, to ripen into conduct against which the public has a right to protect itself." The situation presented here was differentiated from those confronting Justices Holmes and Brandeis, because here the Government was held not to be endeavoring to prevent the dissemination of Communist doctrine, or to suppress certain beliefs because of fear of resulting unlawful action, but rather to protect "the free flow of commerce from what Congress considers to be substantial evils of conduct that are not products of speech at all." The evils envisaged are the political strike as a form of force called by persons who have the power to do so without advocacy or persuasion. "Speech may be fought with speech. Falsehoods and fallacies must be exposed, not suppressed, unless there is not sufficient time to avert the evil consequences of noxious doctrine by argument and education. That is the command of the First Amendment. But force must be met with force." These specific provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act were designed, in the view of the Court, to protect the public not against what Communists and others have said or thought, but against what Congress thinks they have done and are likely to do again.

---

[20] 338 U. S. 294 (1949).

[21] The holding in *Erie R. Co. v. Tompkins,* 304 U. S. 64 (1938), and cases following it, to the effect that federal courts in applying state law in diversity of citizenship cases are bound by state law as reflected by decisions of state courts.

[22] 339 U. S. 382 (1950).

On the basis of these observations, Chief Justice Vinson proceeded to narrow subsequent applications of the "clear and present" doctrine as propounded in *Schenck v. United States*,[23] and to restate the test as meaning that an "imminent danger of any substantive evil that Congress may prevent justifies the restriction of speech." Although such evil must be serious and substantial, this does not mean an absolutist test in terms of danger to the nation; for "When the effect of a statute or ordinance upon the exercise of the First Amendment Freedoms is relatively small and the public interest to be protected is substantial, it is obvious that a rigid test requiring a showing of imminent danger to the security of the Nation is an absurdity." Freedom of speech and assembly, Chief Justice Vinson correctly pointed out, have never been absolute. The problem here was reduced to that of weighing the probable effects of the statute upon these freedoms against the Congressional judgment that political strikes are evils of conduct resulting in substantial harm to interstate commerce. This is a matter for decision with which Congress and not the courts is primarily charged.

At this point the Court introduced the additional argument that when authority, as that of labor unions, is derived in part from governmental action, the exercise of such authority by private persons "becomes closely akin, in some respects, to its exercise by Government itself." Hence, when Congress clothes the bargaining representative of labor with the power to create and restrict the rights of those it represents, the public interest in the exercise of that power becomes very great, and there is nothing in the Constitution to prevent Congress from protecting the national economy against potential injury before it becomes reality.[24] This seems but another way of saying that government may regulate that which it subsidizes.[25]

The provisions concerning belief in the overthrow of government by force were more readily disposed of by confining their meaning to belief "in the objective overthrow" of the government, as it now exists under the Constitution, by force or illegal means. Thus construed they were held not to differ from the provision concerning membership in the Communist Party. No question of thought control was regarded as involved, and no beliefs were outlawed or penalized, inasmuch as loss of a position was not regarded as punishment. These provisions, too, were held not to be void because of vagueness, or as an *ex post facto* law or bill of attainder, or as imposing a religious test for holding office.

---

[23] 249 U. S. 47, 52 (1919).

[24] Citing *North American Co. v. Securities Exchange Commission*, 327 U. S. 686, 711 (1946).

[25] See *Wickard v. Filburn*, 317 U. S. 111, 131 (1942).

Justices Douglas, Minton, and Clark did not participate in this decision; Justice Black dissented on the ground that the whole section was invalid; and Justices Frankfurter and Jackson wrote opinions, in which they concurred with the majority on the provisions pertaining to membership in the Communist Party, but dissented from that portion of the opinion sustaining the provisions concerning belief in the overthrow of the government by force. Justice Frankfurter regarded these provisions as an unconstitutional probing into opinions. In an elaborate opinion, Justice Jackson reviewed the aims and methods of the Communist Party. As a result of the Party's nature, he could not conclude that "Congress has less power to protect a labor union from Communist Party domination than it has from employer domination." Moreover, "Our Constitution is not a covenant of non-resistance toward organized efforts at disruption and betrayal either of labor or of the country." With respect to thought control, however, he pointed out that only in the darkest moments of history have western governments concerned themselves with mere belief and that, since Congress has not outlawed the political strike, it is a paradox for one to be forbidden an idea which he is free to execute. He rejected the assumption that the power to forbid acts includes the power to forbid contemplating them. "Can we say," he asked, "that men of our time must not even think about the propositions on which our own Revolution was justified? Or, may they think, provided they reach only one conclusion—and that the opposite of Mr. Jefferson's?" He concluded by asserting that there is an "unrestricted constitutional right of each member to think as he will," and that the disclosure of any belief unconnected with any overt act is beyond the power of Congress to compel.

The same issues were again decided by the Court four weeks later in *Osman v. Douds*.[26] Justice Minton, who had not participated in the earlier decision, joined the majority; Justice Douglas joined the minority on the provisions concerning belief, while contending that it was unnecessary to decide the constitutionality of the anti-Communist provision. Justices Black, Frankfurter, and Jackson adhered to their earlier views, and Justice Clark took no part in the case. Here, again, except for the absence of Justice Douglas in the earlier case, and for changes in the personnel of the Court, the outcome of these cases with respect to the belief provisions would have undoubtedly been different.

Searches and Seizures. Another very important case decided during the 1949 term, and one which would have been decided the other way but for changes in judicial personnel, was *United States v. Rabinowitz*.[27] Here Rabinowitz had been convicted on two counts of possessing forged overprints of United States postage stamps. One count was based on his sale to a postal employee of four stamps with forged overprints; the other was based on 573 stamps seized during an intensive search made of Rabinowitz's room as an incident to his lawful arrest without a search warrant, although the Government had from seven to fifteen days in which to procure a warrant. The conviction was reversed by the Circuit Court of Appeals in an opinion by Judge Learned Hand on the authority of *Trupiano v. United States*,[28] which had held a search warrant necessary whenever it is practicable to obtain it. In an unconvincing opinion in which a number of older cases were misinterpreted and the Trupiano decision reversed, Justice Minton held the search and seizure valid. There was a strong dissent by Justice Frankfurter, in which Justice Jackson joined, and a mild dissent by Justice Black, whose indifference to rights of privacy against unreasonable searches and seizures has been consistent and well-known.[29] Justice Douglas did not participate in the decision, but his past record on this issue is similar to that of Justice Black.

---

[26] 339 U. S. 846 (1950).

[27] 339 U. S. 56 (1950).

Justice Minton's reasoning proceeds as follows. First, on the authority of *United States v. Weeks*,[30] the right to search the person after a valid arrest has always been recognized in this country and in England. For this to be apposite, however, search of "the person" must be extended to include the whole of a room used as a business office and a safe and filing cabinets within it. Second, on the authority of *Carroll v. United States*,[31] there was probable cause. However, as Justice Frankfurter indicated in his dissent, the Carroll case involved a moving vehicle and the necessity for search without a warrant was a primary consideration. Third, in order to seize things connected with the crime, there is an area of search beyond the person proper which is said to stem not only from the authority to search the person, but from "the long standing practice of searching for other proofs of guilt." Hence, the premises under the control of the person arrested are subject to search without a warrant. The cases cited to support this contention[32] do no more, as Justice Frankfurter indicated, than permit the search of an arrested person in order to protect the arresting officer and prevent the escape of the accused, or to avoid the destruction of evidence, or to permit the seizure of items in open view. The cases beginning with the Weeks case do not justify the decision, continued Justice Frankfurter in his dissent, but "merely prove how a hint becomes a suggestion, is loosely turned into a dictum and finally elevated to a decision" by a "progressive distortion" arising from "an uncritical confusion" of the right to search and arrest a person for articles in his immediate physical control, the right to seize visible instruments or fruits of crime at the scene of arrest, and an alleged right to search the place of arrest.

[28] 334 U. S. 699 (1948).

[29] See, for example, *Davis v. United States*, 328 U. S. 582 (1946); *Harris v. United States*, 331 U. S. 145 (1947); and *Trupiano v. United States*, 334 U. S. 699 (1948). Justice Black dissented in the last of these cases, and joined in the opinions of the Court by Justice Douglas in the Davis case and Chief Justice Vinson in the Harris case.

[30] 232 U. S. 383, 392 (1914).

[31] 267 U. S. 132 (1925).

[32] *Marron v. United States*, 275 U. S. 192 (1927); *Agnello v. United States*, 269 U. S. 20, 30 (1925); *Carroll v. United States*, 267 U. S. 132, 158 (1925); *Boyd v. United States*, 116 U. S. 616, 623–624 (1886).

Fourth, the search was not general or exploratory, but specific. Fifth, what constitutes reasonable search is not defined in the Constitution and is not "to be determined by any fixed formula," but by the circumstances and facts of each case. Finally, adequate time to obtain a search warrant is neither an essential ingredient nor a *sine qua non* of reasonableness. In other words, as put by Justice Minton, "The relevant test is not whether it is reasonable to procure a search warrant, but whether the search was reasonable."

Justice Frankfurter's dissent deserves further notice for its review of the historical background of the Fourth Amendment, its discrimination in the use of precedents, its solicitude for the right of privacy against general searches without a warrant, and its warning to the Court that "Respect for continuity in law, where reasons for change are wanting, alone requires adherence to *Trupiano* and the other decisions. Especially ought the Court not to reenforce needlessly the instabilities of our time by giving fair ground for the belief that Law is the expression of chance—for instance of unexpected changes in the Court's composition and the contingencies in the choice of successors." In the light both of the specific decision and the reasoning upon which it is based, it is no exaggeration to state that the right of privacy against unreasonable searches and seizures has been relegated, as Justice Jackson has intimated elsewhere, "to a deferred position."[33]

The Court displayed a greater solicitude for the right of privacy in *District of Columbia v. Little*.[34] This case involved the refusal of an individualistic proprietress of an allegedly unsanitary boarding house to admit a health inspector without a search warrant. In an opinion by Justice Black, the Court declined to pass upon broad contentions made under the Fourth Amendment, but held the conduct of the defendant not to be interference with an officer, on the ground that the right to privacy is too important to justify the punishment of one guilty of no more recalcitrance than was involved here. Justices Burton and Reed aligned themselves on the side of sanitation against privacy in a dissent by the former.

Right of Administrative Agencies to Books and Records. Decision by metaphor received a reverse in *United States v. Morton Salt Co.*[35] in which a Federal Trade Commission order requiring certain reports concerning compliance with Commission orders was attacked as "a fishing expedition," and therefore invalid. For a unanimous Court Justice Jackson admitted, for purposes of argument, that the order constituted "a fishing expedition," but sustained it as a valid exercise of the subpoena power, while admitting the application of the Fourth and Fifth Amendments to administrative investigations. In an interesting line of reasoning, Justice Jackson pointed to the inherent limitations of the judicial power to conduct investigations which were "engrafted upon the administrative process. . . . courts could not go fishing, and so it followed neither could anyone else." Administrative investigations fell before the colorful and nostalgic slogan "no fishing expeditions." The reasoning of the Court, coupled with its contrast between the intolerance of administrative action in *Jones v. Securities and Exchange Commission*[36] and the tolerance of it in *United States v. Morgan*,[37] would appear to overrule the former. It would also seem to be inconsistent with the reasoning to undermine the American Tobacco Company case,[38] in which Justice Holmes originated the metaphor subsequently followed with less discrimination.

---

[33] *Brinegar v. United States*, 338 U. S. 160, 180 (1949). See also Charles A. Reynard, "Freedom from Unreasonable Search and Seizure—A Second Class Constitutional Right?" *Indiana Law Journal*, Vol. 25, pp. 259–313 (1950).

[34] 339 U. S. 1 (1950).

[35] 338 U. S. 632 (1950).

Due Process of Law. The most important due process case to arise under either the Fifth or Fourteenth Amendments was *United States ex rel. Knauff v. Shaugnessy.*[39] This involved the exclusion of an alien war-bride from the United States by the Attorney General, without a hearing and after refusal to reveal the reasons for exclusion, solely on the finding that her admission would be prejudicial to the interest of the United States. This action was taken in pursuance of regulations promulgated by the Secretary of State and the Attorney General, on the basis of the amendments to the immigration laws contained in the Act of June 21, 1941, which authorized the President to impose additional restrictions on the migration of persons to and from the United States. Though born in Germany, Mrs. Knauff left that country for Czechoslovakia during the Hitler regime. After a marriage and divorce in that country, she left for England in 1939, where she served with the Royal Air Force "efficiently and honorably" from 1943 to mid-1946. She then obtained employment with the United States War Department in Germany, which rated her services as "very good" and "excellent." In 1948 she married Knauff, with the permission of the Commanding General.

The major contentions in the case centered about the validity of that regulation which authorized the Attorney General to deny a hearing in special cases where he determined that the alien was subject, on the basis of confidential information, to exclusion under regulations the disclosure of which would be prejudicial to the public interest. For a majority of the Court, Justice Minton repeated the trite rule that the entry of aliens is a privilege and not a right. Then he proceeded successively to derive the power to exclude aliens from legislative and executive power and to identify due process and congressional process in alien exclusion cases. With reference to the power to exclude aliens, Justice Minton found no inappropriate delegation of power in the regulation because the exclusion of aliens is, in his words, "a fundamental act of sovereignty," and the right to exclude aliens stems not alone from legislative power, but is "inherent in the executive power to control the foreign affairs of the nation." To arrive at this conclusion, Justice Minton combines *Fong Yue Ting v. United States*[40] and *United States v. Curtiss-Wright Export Corporation*,[41] which he cites as authorities. In prescribing a procedure for admitting aliens Congress "is not dealing alone with a legislative power" but is "implementing an inherent executive power." Accordingly the decision to admit or exclude an alien may be placed with the President. The President, in turn, may delegate the function of decision to a responsible executive officer, whose action is final and conclusive. Finally, Justice Minton concluded, "Whatever the procedure authorized by Congress is, it is due process as far as an alien denied entry is concerned."[42] Having disposed of the constitutional issues, the Court proceeded to rule that Mrs. Knauff had no statutory right of entry under the War Brides Act and to sustain the action of the Attorney General.

---

[36] 298 U. S. 1 (1936). [37] 307 U. S. 183, 193 (1939).

[38] *Federal Trade Commission v. American Tobacco Co.*, 264 U. S. 298, 306 (1924).

[39] 338 U. S. 537 (1950). [40] 149 U. S. 698 (1893). [41] 299 U. S. 304 (1936).

Justices Douglas and Clark did not participate in this decision. Justice Frankfurter dissented on the basis of the interpretation of the War Brides Act, and Justice Jackson, in a forceful dissent in which Justices Black and Frankfurter joined, took exception to the procedure and the result on the basis of excess of power under the statute. Without questioning the constitutional power of Congress to exclude any alien or any class of aliens, Justice Jackson wisely observed:

> Security is like liberty in that many are the crimes committed in its name. The menace to the security of this country, be it great as it may, from this girl's admission is as nothing compared to the menace to free institutions inherent in procedures of this pattern. In the name of security the police state justifies its arbitrary oppression on evidence that is secret. . . . The plea that evidence of guilt must be secret is abhorrent to free men, because it provides a cloak for the malevolent, the misinformed, the meddlesome and the corrupt to play the role of informer undetected and uncorrected.[43]

Procedural due process fared somewhat better in the deportation case of *Wong Yang Sung v. McGrath.*[44] Here the Court rejected the Government's argument that a hearing in a deportation proceeding is not required either by due process or by the Administrative Procedure Act. Over the dissent of Justice Reed, the Court, speaking through Justice Jackson, held that procedural due process requires a hearing in deportation proceedings because they involve "issues basic to human liberty and happiness, and in the present upheavals in lands to which aliens may be returned, to life itself. It might be difficult to justify as measuring up to constitutional standards of impartiality a hearing the like of which has been condemned by Congress as unfair even where less vital matters of property rights are at stake."

The last of the three federal due process cases, *Ewing v. Mytinger and Casselberry,*[45] sustained the validity of the provision of the Pure Food, Drug, and Cosmetics Act which authorizes multiple seizures of misbranded articles without a hearing, upon a finding of probable cause by the administrator that the article is dangerous to health, or that misbranding is either fraudulent or misleading in a material respect to the injury or damage of the consumer. The case was decided on the basis of the familiar rule that a hearing is not necessary at the preliminary stages of administrative action so long as one is held before the final order becomes effective. Speaking for the Court, Justice Douglas compared such preliminary proceedings in administration to an indictment by a grand jury in a criminal action; Justice Burton concurred in the result; Justice Clark did not participate; and Justices Frankfurter and Jackson dissented from the interpretation placed upon the statute.

---

[42] Citing *Nishimura Ekin v. United States*, 142 U. S. 641 (1892), and *Ludecke v. Watkins*, 335 U. S. 160 (1948).

[43] Citing *In re Oliver*, 333 U. S. 257 (1948), as a comparison.

[44] 339 U. S. 33 (1950). [45] 339 U. S. 594 (1950).

Eminent Domain. Three of the five eminent domain cases involved government taking of property during the second World War. The most important of these was *United States v. Commodities Trading Corporation.*[46] Here a company with highly developed acquisitive instincts held 17,000,000 pounds of pepper in 1944 for speculative profits, once the ceiling on prices should be removed, and contended that it should be compensated at the rate of twenty-two cents per pound for 760,000 pounds of pepper requisitioned during the War to cover "retention value," or the price the company could get after the removal of restrictions. The Court of Claims allowed compensation at the rate of fifteen cents, after taking into account "retention value," the actual cost of the pepper delivered, and other elements. On appeal the United States contended that the OPA ceiling price of 6.63 cents per pound was just. In an opinion by Justice Black, the Court rejected the concept of "retention value" as not being a requirement of the Fifth Amendment, and as a concept which would put a premium on recalcitrance. The necessities of wartime and congressional purposes were held to require that ceiling prices be accepted as the measure of just compensation. Chief Justice Vinson and Justice Douglas took no part in the disposition of this case. Justice Frankfurter, in a partial dissent, rejected retention value, but thought actual costs, if higher than the ceiling price, should be the standard. Justice Jackson, in dissenting, also rejected retention value, but argued that the ceiling price was not the sole measure of just compensation.

In *United States v. Toronto Hamilton & Buffalo Navigation Co.*[47] a unanimous Court rejected the elements of past earnings, market value, and original and reproduction costs as elements in establishing just compensation for a ferry seized for war purposes. The case was remanded to the Court of Claims. In *United States v. Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co.*,[48] the Court held in accordance with *United States v. Petty Motors Co.*[49] that a company was not entitled to include costs for removal from a lease taken by the Government in the measure of just compensation, even though the original period of the taking was less than the remainder of the life of the lease. This result was reached because the entire lease was later extinguished by renewals of options by the United States. Justice Jackson dissented.

The two remaining just compensation cases had to do with damages allegedly resulting from federal water and reclamation projects. In *United States v. Kansas City Life Insurance Co.*,[50] the Court, in an opinion by Justice Burton, held that the United States cannot raise a navigable stream to its high-water level and maintain it there without compensating for damages to agricultural values of land beyond the bed of the stream, even though there is no actual overflowing of the land. The damages here were regarded as resulting from interference with drainage. Justice Minton wrote a separate dissent; and Justice Douglas wrote a dissent in which Justices Black, Reed, and Minton concurred. Justice Douglas advocated the reversal of *United States v. Cress,*[51] which sustains compensation for all injuries inflicted by any change in the natural level and flow of a stream. The Reclamation Act of 1902, which provided for compensation of rights according to state law, was applied in *United States v. Gerlach Live Stock Co.*[52] so as to include damages arising from the destruction of a natural seasonal overflow of the San Joaquim River, which had previously benefited riparian grass lands. Justices Douglas and Black dissented in part. No constitutional issue was involved.

---

[46] 339 U. S. 121 (1950).

[47] 338 U. S. 396 (1949).

[48] 339 U. S. 261 (1950).

[49] 327 U. S. 372 (1946).

[50] 339 U. S. 799 (1950).

Double Jeopardy. In the solitary case involving double jeopardy, *Bryan v. United States,*[53] the Court unanimously applied the familiar rule that the requirement of a defendant to stand trial again after reversal of a prior conviction for the same offense does not violate the Fifth Amendment.

Trial by Jury. The Communists provided the raw materials for constitutional law in *Dennis v. United States,*[54] where Dennis challenged the validity of his conviction for refusal to testify before the Un-American Activities Committee by a District of Columbia jury composed of seven federal employees and five other persons. When called to trial, Dennis moved a change of venue on the ground that he could not obtain a fair trial in the District because government employees were subject to loss of their positions for disloyalty, and would fear the possible results flowing from a vote for acquittal. The motion was denied, and all government employees were challenged for cause. The seven federal employees, who were accepted after the exhaustion of peremptory challenges, expressed the belief that they could render an impartial verdict. Following *United States v. Wood*[55] and *Frazier v. United States,*[56] the Court sustained the conviction. Justice Minton agreed that a member of an unpopular minority is entitled to "that solicitude which properly accompanies an accused person," but went on to declare that he is not entitled to universal protection. Justice Reed concurred on the basis that in his view the opinion means government employees may be barred for implied bias when acts properly brought to the attention of the Court convince it that government employees would not make suitable jurors in a particular case.

Although Justice Jackson adhered "with increasing conviction" to his dissent in the Frazier case and announced that he would be glad to join a majority to overrule that "weird and misguided decision," he concurred in the result on the ground that so long as the rule stood which permitted federal employees to serve on juries in the District of Columbia, and so long as "Republicans, Dixiecrats, Socialists, or Democrats must put up with such a jury it will have to do for Communists." Justice Frankfurter also adhered to Justice Jackson's dissent in the Frazier case, but did not urge its reversal. He dissented because he thought that the rule should not be extended and that an exception should be made to it in disloyalty cases. Justice Black, in a separate dissent, contended that no juror can meet the test of impartiality if he has reason to fear that "a vote for acquittal would subject him to harassing investigations and perhaps cost him his job." To say that a government employee could meet the test of impartiality was, in his view, to disregard human nature. Justices Douglas and Clark did not participate. In *Morford v. United States*,[57] the Court made some concessions in a *per curiam* opinion to the opponents of the Frazier rule by holding that refusal to permit defense counsel to interrogate prospective jurors in the employ of the federal government, on their *voir dire* with reference to the possible influence of the Loyalty Order on their ability to render an impartial verdict, constituted reversible error. Justice Douglas concurred for the reasons stated by the dissenters in the Frazier case, and Justices Black and Frankfurter concurred on the basis of their dissents in the Dennis case.

---

[51] 243 U. S. 316 (1917).

[52] 339 U. S. 725 (1950).

[53] 338 U. S. 553 (1950).

[54] 339 U. S. 162 (1950).

[55] 299 U. S. 123 (1936).

[56] 335 U. S. 497 (1949).

B. QUESTIONS OF STATE POWER

1. DUE PROCESS OF LAW

Freedom of Speech. All three cases dealing with freedom of speech during the 1949 term were decided on May 8, 1950; all concerned limitations on picketing; and all contributed to further attrition of the right to picket as a phase of freedom of speech. *Hughes v. Superior Court of California*[58] sustained punishment for contempt arising out of a violation of an injunction restraining picketing of a store because of its refusal to employ Negroes in proportion to population as white workers vacated their jobs, on the ground that there was no interference with freedom of speech. Justice Frankfurter as spokesman for the Court admitted that picketing is a form of communication, but declared that "it is inseparably something more and different," and, therefore, is not the legal equivalent of speech. Accordingly, the manner in which picketing is conducted or its purpose may give rise to its control by that state. That California policy was expressed by the judicial organs of government was regarded as insignificant, since the Fourteenth Amendment leaves the states free to distribute the powers of government as they choose between the legislative and judicial organs. Justices Black and Minton thought the case was controlled by *Giboney v. Empire Storage and Ice Co.*[59] Justice Reed concurred. There were no dissents. A similar result was reached in *Building Service Employees International Union v. Gazzam*,[60] which sustained the application of a Washington State statute to restrain the picketing of a hotel in order to compel it to coerce its employees into joining a union of which no employees were members. The Court took notice of the fact that the statute did not prohibit picketing generally and applied the rule of the Giboney case. Justice Black concurred. There were no dissents.

The most important picketing case was *International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers Union v. Hanke*,[61] which sustained a state court injunction in Washington restraining picketing designed to compel self-employed owners of businesses with no other employees to observe the opening and closing hours set by the union. Justice Frankfurter, again as spokesman for the Court, declared that picketing "cannot be dogmatically equated" with freedom of speech and accepted the characterization of the Court's picketing doctrine as indeed "a hybrid."[62] He then proceeded to extract some of the speech elements from this rather unnatural union by construing *Senn v. Tile Layers' Protective Union*[63] narrowly, and thereby further contributed to the eclipse of *Thornhill v. Alabama.*[64] Justice Frankfurter asserted that the state had not struck "a balance so inconsistent with rooted traditions of a free people that it must be found an unconstitutional choice." He concluded by confining three earlier cases[65] concerning picketing to the rule that a state may not proscribe picketing "merely by setting artificial bounds, unreal in the light of modern circumstances to what constitutes an industrial relationship or a labor dispute." Justice Black dissented for the reasons given in his dissent in *Carpenters and Joiners Union v. Ritter's Cafe.*[66] Justices Minton and Reed, in a dissent by the former, protested that the picketing was peaceful publicity, not enmeshed with violence.

---

[57] 339 U. S. 258 (1950).

[58] 339 U. S. 460 (1950).

[59] 336 U. S. 490 (1949).

[60] 339 U. S. 532 (1950).

[61] 339 U. S. 470 (1950).

Although the Court did not specifically overrule the Thornhill case, it effectively repudiated its assimilation of picketing to speech, with the result that with other decisions[67] the Thornhill doctrine has become an aberration in constitutional law as it was originally an aberration from reality. It remains true, of course, that all picketing cannot be prohibited, but a state has a broad latitude in regulating the conduct of picketing, and in narrowly confining the purposes for which it is carried on.

Freedom of Assembly. The single case involving freedom of assembly was *Cole v. Arkansas.*[68] It also restricted picketing by unanimously sustaining convictions under an Arkansas statute prohibiting unlawful assembly at or near a place of a labor dispute, and the use of force or violence to prevent any person from engaging in a lawful vocation, or promoting, encouraging, or aiding any such unlawful assemblage. Here the statute had been applied in the state court so as to require that the accused aid the assemblage with the intention that force and violence would be used to prevent a person from working. The Court also rejected arguments that the statute infringed the right of expression of views in labor disputes, and that it violated due process as being unconstitutionally vague.

---

[62] Citing Paul A. Freund, *On Understanding the Supreme Court* (Boston, 1949), p. 18; and Louis L. Jaffe, "In Defense of the Supreme Court's Picketing Doctrine," *Michigan Law Review*, Vol. 41, p. 1037 (1943).

[63] 301 U. S. 468, 481 (1937).

[64] 310 U. S. 88 (1940).

[65] *American Federation of Labor v. Swing*, 312 U. S. 321 (1941); *Bakery & Pastry Drivers and Helpers Local v. Wohl*, 315 U. S. 769 (1942); and *Cafeteria Employees Union v. Angelos*, 320 U. S. 293 (1943). None of these cases, as Justice Frankfurter indicated, involved state policy in favor of self-employers.

[66] 315 U. S. 722, 729–732 (1942). This case sustained a Texas court injunction restraining picketing of a restaurant because its owner employed a non-union contractor to build his house some distance from the restaurant.

[67] In addition to the Ritter's Cafe case, these are *Milk Wagon Drivers' Union v. Meadowmoor Dairies, Inc.*, 312 U. S. 287 (1941); and *Hotel and Restaurant Employees International Alliance v. Wisconsin Employment Relations Board*, 315 U. S. 437 (1942).

[68] 338 U. S. 345 (1949).

Notice. In *Mullane v. Central Hanover Bank and Trust Co.*[69] the Court pronounced unconstitutional a New York statute providing for notice by publication in newspapers of trust accounting proceedings as applied to known beneficiaries with known places of residence, while holding it valid with respect to beneficiaries whose interests or whereabouts could not be ascertained with due diligence. After noting that the right to be heard is of little reality without notice, Justice Jackson concluded that the statutory notice to known beneficiaries was inadequate, not because it might fail to reach everyone, but because, in the circumstances, it failed to reach those who could easily have been informed by other means. The mails, he indicated, are "an efficient and inexpensive means of communication." Justice Burton dissented.

Sanity of Convicted Persons. Following the reasoning of *Williams v. New York,*[70] the Court upheld a Georgia statute authorizing the governor to determine, with the aid of physicians, the sanity of convicted persons under the death sentence in *Solesbee v. Balkcom.*[71] Justice Black, as spokesman for the Court, dismissed at the outset the contention that the execution of an insane person is cruel and unusual punishment, in pursuance of the Court's policy not to go beyond the constitutional issues necessarily raised in the record, inasmuch as the Georgia statute did not condone the execution of insane persons. This decision evoked an emphatic dissent from Justice Frankfurter, who objected to the *ex parte* nature of the hearing and contended that due process precludes the execution of an insane person. His dissent characteristically invoked natural law doctrines which he blended with the "underlying sentiments of our society." A portion of his naturalist argument runs as follows: "It is now the settled policy of this Court that the Due Process Clause embodies a system of rights based on moral principles so deeply embedded in the traditions and feelings of our people as to be deemed fundamental to a civilized society as conceived by our whole history. Due Process is that which comports with the deepest notions of what is fair and right and just. . . . In applying such a large untechnical concept as 'due process of law,' the Court enforces those permanent and pervasive feelings of our society as to which there is compelling evidence of the kind relevant to judgments on social institutions."

Right to Counsel. In accordance with the rule of *Betts v. Brady*[72] to the effect that the right to counsel in the trial of non-capital offenses depends on the facts of the specific case, and that a defendant must prove lack of counsel is an active ingredient of unfairness, the Court in *Quicksall v. Michigan*[73] sustained a conviction in the absence of trial counsel. Here the defendant, forty-four years old, had what was described as a fairly keen intellect and considerable prior experience in Court, and he had not requested counsel at the time of his trial in 1937. As a result of ten years of introspection and retrospection in prison, the defendant, who had been convicted of murdering his mistress, asked the state courts to vacate his sentence on the basis of alleged irregularities in the preliminary hearing, and lack of trial. These allegations were not urged in the trial and could not be considered by the Supreme Court for the first time, Justice Frankfurter concluded. Justice Black, who has consistently insisted that the right to counsel is absolutely essential to due process in all cases, dissented without an opinion.

---

[69] 339 U. S. 306 (1950).

[70] 337 U. S. 241 (1949).

[71] 339 U. S. 9 (1950).

[72] 316 U. S. 455, 462 (1942).

[73] 339 U. S. 660 (1950).

State Regulation. The persisting and spectacular insignificance of due process as a limit to the regulatory power of the states, is reflected by *Travelers Health Association v. Virginia.*[74] Here the Court, in an opinion by Justice Black, sustained a provision of the Virginia Blue Sky Law which requires sellers of insurance and securities in the state to obtain a permit and to agree to the filing of suits against them by service on the secretary of state, even though it was applied to a small health insurance agency conducting all of its activities in Nebraska, but doing a mail order business in Virginia through the members of the association acting as unpaid solicitors. This decision was based on the ruling in *Hoopeston Canning Co. v. Cullen*[75] to the effect that the state's power to regulate is not to be determined by a conceptualistic discussion of the place of making or executing a contract, but by the consequences of the contract. Justice Douglas concurred on the basis of the use of members in Virginia to solicit new members. Justice Minton dissented in an opinion in which Justice Jackson joined. Justices Reed and Frankfurter concurred with the Court in reaching the merits of the case, but joined the dissenters on the merits.

State Taxation. In accord with the familiar rule of *Frick v. Pennsylvania*[76] that due process precludes a state from taxing tangible property outside its jurisdiction, *Treichler v. Wisconsin*[77] invalidated a state emergency inheritance tax which was in addition to normal estate taxes as applied to tangible property in Florida and Illinois. Justice Black, in dissenting, urged the limitation of the Frick rule.

2. EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS

Conceptions of equal protection were advanced to new frontiers in *Sweatt v. Painter*[78] and *McLaurin v. Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education,*[79] where the Court unanimously and effectively condemned racial segregation in the graduate and professional schools of state universities. In the former case, the Court held that the exclusion of a negro applicant from the University of Texas Law School was a denial of equal protection in the face of arguments that a separate law school for Negroes provided for equal facilities. The Chief Justice drew pointed contrasts between the two law schools, with respect to the size and prestige of their faculties, the size of the respective student bodies and libraries, the presence of the order of the Coif at the University and its absence at the negro school, the existence of a law review at the University and its lack at the negro school, the positions of distinction occupied by the alumni of the University law school in private practice and public life in contrast to that of the solitary and lonely alumnus of the negro law school, and the accredited standing of the University law school. In addition to these items, the Court pointed to the greater variety of courses and opportunity for specialization at the University law school, a combination of factors producing "those qualities which are incapable of objective measurement but which make for greatness in a law school." The Court also stated that the law school to which Texas was willing to admit the applicant excluded from its student body 85 per cent of the population of the state, which consisted of most of the lawyers, witnesses, judges and jurors, and other officials with whom negro lawyers would be dealing. Although the Court refused to re-examine the equal and separate facilities doctrine of *Plessy v. Ferguson*,[80] it effectively undermined it by laying down criteria which render the application of the doctrine impossible, and which, in effect, require identical facilities, if the humane demands of equal protection are to be satisfied.

---

[74] 339 U. S. 643 (1950).

[75] 318 U. S. 313, 316 (1943).

[76] 268 U. S. 477 (1925).

[77] 338 U. S. 251 (1949).

[78] 339 U. S. 629 (1950).

[79] 339 U. S. 637 (1950).

This conclusion is fortified by the ruling in the McLaurin case, where a Negro, after admission to the University of Oklahoma, was subjected to various kinds and degrees of discrimination with respect to his use of university facilities. McLaurin at first was forced to sit in an anteroom adjacent to the main classroom, and was later segregated in a portion of the main classroom which was surrounded by a rail marked "Reserved for Colored." In the library he was confined, at first, to the use of the mezzanine floor, and later segregated at a table in the main reading room, which was reserved for colored. When he first entered the University, he was permitted to eat in the school cafeteria, but was required to eat at a time different from that of white students. Later he was permitted to eat at any time he so desired, but was segregated at a table reserved for colored. All these discriminations, Chief Justice Vinson declared, set McLaurin apart from other students so that he was "handicapped in his pursuit of effective graduate instruction," impaired and inhibited in "his ability to study, to engage in discussions and exchange views with other students, and, in general, to learn his profession." Moreover, these restrictions not only worked inequalities upon McLaurin, but on those who would come under his guidance and influence. That McLaurin's fellow students might set him apart was held irrelevant, for "There is a vast difference—a constitutional difference—between restrictions imposed by the state which prohibit the intellectual commingling of students, and the refusal of students to commingle where the state presents no such bar."

The judicial onslaught against segregation was continued in *Henderson v. United States*,[81] where the Court avoided the decision of constitutional issues by holding unanimously that the practice of the Southern Railway Company, in allocating one table for the exclusive use of Negroes, separated by a partition from ten tables available for whites, violated the provision of the Interstate

---

[80] 163 U. S. 537 (1896).

[81] 339 U. S. 816 (1950).

Commerce Act, which makes it unlawful for the railroads to subject any particular person to any undue or unreasonable prejudice or disadvantage.

The third and last of the cases involving equal protection was *Cassell v. Texas*,[82] which reversed the conviction of a Negro because of discrimination against him through the selection of white men alone for the grand jury that indicted him. Justice Reed's opinion, in which he announced the judgment of the Court, stressed the invalidity either of excluding Negroes from grand juries, or of limiting their numbers as a race on them. The opinion rejected the state's contention that the result was due to lack of knowledge of qualified Negroes on the part of the commissioners and that the choice of such jurors was made only from their acquaintances, on the ground that it is the duty of the grand jury commissioners to be familiar with the qualifications of jurors without reference to race or color. Justice Frankfurter wrote a concurring opinion in which Justices Burton and Minton concurred. In their view it was not the absence or presence of a Negro on the grand jury that was relevant, but the purposeful discrimination against Negroes as a race, whether in excluding them or limiting their number to one. Justice Jackson dissented on the assumption that the defendant had not been harmed by the irregularity, and urged that in this and similar cases the Court send a copy of the record of the discrimination to the Attorney General for prosecution, as an adequate substitute for reversal of conviction. Justice Clark's tendency to be agreeable led him to join Justice Reed's opinion and to write a separate concurring opinion in which he expressed some agreement with Justice Jackson's dissent. Justice Douglas did not participate in this case.

C. FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS

1. OWNERSHIP OF THE TIDELANDS

With a tenacity amounting to perversity, Louisiana contested the title of the United States to the lands, minerals and other things underlying the Gulf of Mexico seaward of the low water mark in *United States v. Louisiana*.[83] After being rebuffed both on a motion to dismiss the suit as one prohibited by the Eleventh Amendment and on a demurrer that the ground lessees of the lands were indispensable parties to the suit, Louisiana with persistent futility moved for a jury trial in the Supreme Court,[84] even though the proceeding was one in equity, on the contention that the suit was in reality an action at law.

Louisiana, like all the states admitted to the Union by act of Congress, was admitted "on an equal footing with the original states, in all respects whatever." The act of admission fixed the southern boundary as the Gulf of Mexico, including all islands within three leagues of the shore. In 1938, however, the state legislature declared the southern boundary to be twenty-seven marine miles from the shore, and thereby persisted in the state's separatist tendencies manifested at various times since the Burr Conspiracy. On the basis of *United States v. California*,[85] the issue was held not to turn on "title or ownership in the conventional sense." The Federal government had first asserted its claim over the three-mile belt, and the protection and control of that area were held to be "functions of external sovereignty." Continuing, Justice Douglas asserted that "The marginal sea is a national, not a state concern. . . . The problems of commerce, national defense, relations with other powers, war and peace focus there. National rights must therefore be paramount in that area." Hence, the Court could find no relevant difference between the claims of Louisiana and California. Although Justice Frankfurter found the reasoning of *United States v. California* no more persuasive with the passage of time, he regarded the question as no longer open. Justices Jackson and Clark did not participate in the case.

---

[82] 339 U. S. 282 (1950).

[83] 339 U. S. 699 (1950).

[84] At least one precedent exists for trial by jury of common law cases in the Supreme Court. In *Georgia v. Brailsford*, 3 Dall. 1 (1794), a special jury was impaneled to try a case brought by the State of Georgia to recover a debt from a private person. The jury returned a verdict in favor of Brailsford.

United States v. Texas[86] differed somewhat in that Texas's claims were more modest. These claims were confined to three marine leagues from the shore, and were based on the contention that, as an independent nation, the Republic of Texas had open, adverse and exclusive possession over the land and mineral deposits underlying this area of the Gulf of Mexico. Texas claimed, further, that rights to this area were recognized and preserved in the state by the agreement between the Republic of Texas and the United States which, it was argued, confirmed the three-league boundary. Like Louisiana, Texas sought to delay action by moving unsuccessfully for the dismissal of the suit as prohibited by the Eleventh Amendment, and by additional motions for an order to take the depositions of specified elderly persons respecting their knowledge and use of subsoils and minerals in the disputed area and for the appointment of a special master to take testimony. As a preliminary to his rejection of these claims, Justice Douglas cited the "equal-footing" clause on which Texas was admitted and the Joint Resolution for the annexation of Texas, which provided that after the state had ceded to the United States "all public edifices, fortifications, barracks, ports and harbors, navy and navy yards . . . and all other property and means pertaining to the public defence," which had belonged to the Republic of Texas, the state should retain, along with its public funds, debts, etc., "all the vacant and unappropriated lands lying within its limits."

The "equal-footing" clause of the Joint Resolution was held determinative of the issue, and when Texas entered the union it relinquished any claim it may have had to the marginal sea. Justice Douglas then averred that, although *dominium* and *imperium* are ordinarily separate, this was an instance "where property rights are so subordinated to the rights of sovereignty as to follow sovereignty" and "in substance to coalesce and unite in the national sovereign." Finally, the "equal-footing" clause was held to prevent the "extension of the sovereignty of a State into a domain of political and sovereign power of the United States from which the other States have been excluded." All other issues were decided on the basis of the California and Louisiana decisions. Justice Reed, in a dissent in which Justice Minton joined, saw no difference in the California and Louisiana cases, but regarded Texas' claims as different because of its earlier existence as an independent republic. The equal-footing clause, contended Justice Reed, embraced only political rights, and the Joint Resolution left to Texas all unappropriated lands within its limits. Justice Frankfurter was puzzled as to how Texas had lost what it had and the United States had acquired it.

---

[85] 332 U. S. 19 (1947).

[86] 339 U. S. 707 (1950).

2. STATE POWER AND INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Only two cases arose in which the police and taxing powers of the states collided with the interstate commerce power. In *International Union of United Automobile, Aircraft and Agricultural Equipment Workers v. O'Brien,*[87] the Court invalidated a Michigan labor mediation law providing for a strike vote within twenty days of notice and requiring a majority vote of all employees to authorize a strike, as being in conflict with the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947, which set a period of sixty days and did not require such a a majority. Justice Douglas concurred in the result on which the decision was unanimous. In *Capitol Greyhound Lines v. Brice,*[88] the Court, speaking through Justice Black, sustained a Maryland excise tax upon the fair market value of motor vehicles used in interstate commerce as a condition to the issuance of certificates of title as prerequisites to the registration and operation of motor vehicles in the state. Because the tax was applied to vehicles used both in interstate and intrastate commerce and the proceeds utilized for road purposes, and because the Court considered the tax, though actually separate, as an adjunct of Maryland's mileage tax, it was able to find that the total charge varied substantially with the mileage travelled. Since complete fairness would require the tax formula to vary with every factor affecting road use, the majority was satisfied with "rough approximation rather than precision."[89] Accordingly, the Court concluded that a tax like that of Maryland is valid "unless the amount is shown to be in excess of fair compensation for the privilege of using state roads." No excessive charge was proved and the burden of proof in such cases was imposed on the carrier.

Justice Frankfurter, who was joined by Justice Jackson in a dissent, was not so easily satisfied by "rough approximation," and contended that the burden of proof was on the state to justify the tax as compensation for road use. He stated correctly that the formula of excessiveness of amount was in conflict with other cases,[90] but ignored the fact that in the confused jumble of conflicting decisions on the power of the states to tax interstate commerce, almost any result can conflict with some previous holding. Justice Frankfurter included in his dissent a useful appendix in which he analysed the decisions involving state taxation of motor vehicles in interstate commerce.

---

[87] 339 U. S. 454 (1950). [88] 339 U. S. 542 (1950).

[89] Citing and quoting *International Harvester Co. v. Evatt,* 329 U. S. 416, 422–423 (1947).

[90] *Interstate Transit Co. v. Lindsey,* 283 U. S. 183 (1931); and *McCarroll v. Dixie Greyhound Lines,* 309 U. S. 176 (1940).

3. TAXATION OF GOVERNMENT INSTRUMENTALITIES

Two relatively unimportant cases which involved no new issues of constitutional tax exemption, were decided during the 1949 term. In *Wilmette Park District v. Campbell,*[91] a unanimous Court sustained a federal admissions tax as applied to tickets of admission to an Illinois part district, on the basis of familiar principles. On the other hand, the Court invalidated a New Jersey tax on a domestic insurance company's capital surplus less liabilities or against net worth, including United States bonds. This was the case of *New Jersey Realty Title Insurance Co. v. Division of Tax Appeals.*[92] Justice Clark wrote the opinions in each of these cases and Justice Black dissented in the latter.

4. MISCELLANEOUS CONFLICTS BETWEEN FEDERAL AND STATE POWER

Conflicts between state property and banking laws and national power were resolved in *United States v. Burnison,*[93] *Roth v. Delano*[94] and *Wissner v. Wissner.*[95] In the first of these cases, the Court sustained a California law prohibiting California domiciliaries from making testamentary gifts to corporations, which was applied so as to deprive the United States government of a bequest, even though the law permitted such bequests to California, its counties, and municipal corporations. Justice Reed distinguished the authorization of the government to receive property under a will from a governmental power. Hence, there was held to be nothing in the supremacy clause to prohibit the state from preventing its domiciliaries from willing property to the federal government. Justice Black dissented without an opinion. In the Roth case, a unanimous Court sustained the power of Michigan to escheat deposits in a national bank, when abandoned by their owners, or when owned by missing persons. Making the state a claimant to what the bank was otherwise obliged to pay was held not to "burden, obstruct, or frustrate" the bank in its performance of federal functions. A conflict between the California community property law and the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, in the Wissner case, was resolved in favor of national supremacy. Here a deceased service man had designated as his beneficiary his parents rather than his estranged wife. The national service insurance premiums were paid from his Army pay which, along with the proceeds of the policy, were regarded by the California courts as community property. The Supreme Court reversed the state court decision and sustained the claims of the elder Wissners to all of the proceeds from the policy. Justice Minton wrote a dissent in which Justices Frankfurter and Jackson concurred.

D. CONCLUSIONS

Aside from those cases which sustained the anti-Communist oath provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act, and which extended the scope of equal protection of the laws against racial segregation in publicly supported institutions of higher education, and the Rabinowitz case, the 1949 term of the Supreme Court was not a notable one. Some of the absolutism previously attributed to free speech was diluted in the Douds cases, and picketing as a form of communication was further dissociated from freedom of speech. Though important for their immediate results, the Tidelands Oil Cases announced no new principles of constitutional law and evoked no surprise. For the fourth consecutive term of Court no act of Congress was invalidated, and only nine acts of state legislatures or administrative agencies were invalidated.[96]

---

[91] 338 U. S. 411 (1949).

[92] 338 U. S. 665 (1950).

[93] 339 U. S. 87 (1950).

[94] 338 U. S. 226 (1949).

[95] 338 U. S. 655 (1950).

For those who desire agreement among Supreme Court Justices, the Court provided a reward in the form of fewer dissents and more unanimous decisions than in the 1948 term. The result was due in part to changes in judicial personnel, and in part to Justice Clark's ability to agree with everyone by refraining from writing a single dissent in the cases considered above. Although the Court reached a unanimous result in fourteen cases,[97] one dissenter is recorded in twelve,[98] two dissents in eleven,[99] three in nine,[100] and four in three cases.[101] A final feature of the Court's work in 1949–1950 was the relatively small number of reversals of earlier decisions. One precedent, though not reversed, was distinguished away,[102] two were definitely overruled,[103] and two others were in effect overruled.[104] Most of the reversals were of cases of fairly recent origin and reflect the ephemeral nature of much of the work the Court has been doing.

---

[96] These were a New York statute governing notice in *Mullane v. Central Hanover Bank & Trust Co.*, 339 U. S. 306 (1950); a Wisconsin inheritance tax as applied to tangible property in other states in *Treichler v. Wisconsin*, 338 U. S. 251 (1949); segregation practices of the University of Texas and the University of Oklahoma in *Sweatt v. Painter*, 339 U. S. 629 (1950), and *McLaurin v. Oklahoma Board of Regents*, 339 U. S. 637 (1950); statutory claims to the Tidelands by Louisiana and Texas in *United States v. Louisiana*, 339 U. S. 699 (1950), and *United States v. Texas*, 339 U. S. 707 (1950); a New Jersey tax as applied to a federal instrumentality in *New Jersey Realty Title Ins. Co. v. Division of Tax Appeals*, 338 U. S. 665 (1950); the application of the California community property law to a national service insurance policy in *Wissner v. Wissner*, 338 U. S. 655 (1950); and the Michigan statute in conflict with an act of Congress in *International Union, etc. v. O'Brien*, 339 U. S. 454 (1950).

[97] *Hiatt v. Brown*, 339 U. S. 103 (1950); *Parker v. Los Angeles County*, 338 U. S. 327 (1949); *United States v. Morton Salt Co.*, 338 U. S. 632 (1950); *U. S. v. Toronto, H. B. N. Co.*, 338 U. S. 396 (1949); *Morford v. United States*, 339 U. S. 258 (1950); *Building Service Employees Union v. Gazzam*, 339 U. S. 532 (1950); *Hughes v. Superior Court*, 339 U. S. 460 (1950); *Cole v. Arkansas*, 338 U. S. 345 (1949); *Sweatt v. Painter*, 339 U. S. 629 (1950); *McLaurin v. Oklahoma Bd. of Regents*, 339 U. S. 637 (1950); *Henderson v. United States*, 339 U. S. 816 (1950); *International Union v. O'Brien*, 339 U. S. 454 (1950); *Wilmette Park Dist. v. Campbell*, 338 U. S. 411 (1949); and *Roth v. Delano*, 338 U. S. 226 (1949).

[98] *Secretary of Agriculture v. Central Roig Ref. Co.*, 338 U. S. 604 (1950); *Slocum v. Delaware, L & W. R. Co.*, 339 U. S. 239 (1950); *Wong Yang Sung v. McGrath*, 339 U. S. 33 (1950); *United States v. Westinghouse Elec. Co.*, 339 U. S. 261 (1950); *Solesbee v. Balkcom*, 339 U. S. 9 (1950); *Quicksall v. Michigan*, 339 U. S. 660 (1950); *Treichler v. Wisconsin*, 338 U. S. 251 (1949); *Cassell v. Texas*, 339 U. S. 282 (1950); *United States v. Louisiana*, 339 U. S. 699 (1950); *New Jersey Realty Title Ins. Co. v. Division of Tax Appeals*, 338 U. S. 665 (1950); *United States v. Burnison*, 339 U. S. 87 (1950); and *Mullane v. Central Hanover Bank*, 339 U. S. 306 (1950).

[99] *Federal Power Commission v. East Ohio Gas Co.*, 338 U. S. 464 (1950); *United States v. Bryan*, 339 U. S. 323 (1950); *United States v. Fleischman*, 339 U. S. 349 (1950); *South v. Peters*, 339 U. S. 276 (1950); *Brown v. Western Ry. Co.*, 338 U. S. 294 (1949); *District of Columbia v. Little*, 339 U. S. 1 (1950); *Ewing v. Mytinger and Casselberry*, 339 U. S. 594 (1950); *United States v. Commodities Trading Corp.*, 339 U. S. 121 (1950); *United States*

---

v. Gerlach Live Stock Co., 339 U. S. 725 (1950); *Dennis v. United States*, 339 U. S. 162 (1950); and *Capitol Greyhound Lines v. Brice*, 339 U. S. 542 (1950).

[100] *United States v. Capitol Transit Co.*, 338 U. S. 286 (1949); *Johnson v. Eisentrager*, 339 U. S. 763 (1950); *Darr v. Burford*, 339 U. S. 200 (1950); *American Communications Assoc. v. Douds*, 339 U. S. 382 (1950); *United States v. Rabinowitz*, 339 U. S. 56 (1950); *United States ex rel. Knauff v. Shaughnessy*, 338 U. S. 537 (1950); *International Brotherhood v. Hanke*, 339 U. S. 470 (1950); *United States v. Texas*, 339 U. S. 707 (1950); and *Wissner v. Wissner*, 338 U. S. 655 (1950).

[101] *Osman v. Douds*, 339 U. S. 846 (1950); *United States v. Kansas City Life Ins. Co.*, 339 U. S. 799 (1950); and *Travellers Health Assoc. v. Virginia*, 339 U. S. 643 (1950).

[102] *Christoffel v. United States*, 338 U. S. 84 (1949), in *United States v. Bryan*, 339 U. S. 323 (1950).

[103] *Wade v. Mayo*, 334 U. S. 672 (1948), in *Darr v. Burford*, 339 U. S. 200 (1950); and *Trupiano v. United States*, 334 U. S. 699 (1948), in *United States v. Rabinowitz*, 339 U. S. 56 (1950).

[104] *Jones v. Securities Exchange Commission*, 298 U. S. 1 (1936), and *Federal Trade Commission v. American Tobacco Co.*, 264 U. S. 298 (1924), in *United States v. Morton Salt Co.*, 338 U. S. 632 (1950).

HOW FAR DOES THE CONSTITUTION SEPARATE CHURCH AND STATE?

LYNFORD A. LARDNER
Northwestern University

Several years ago the Supreme Court of the United States touched off a flood of controversy when it made two attempts to breathe life and meaning into the constitutional injunction that "Congress shall pass no law respecting an establishment of religion." In the first case, *Everson v. Board of Education*,[1] a bare majority decided that a New Jersey township did not violate the injunction when it permitted the use of public funds to pay the transportation charges on common carriers for children attending public and Catholic schools. But in the second case, *McCollum v. Board of Education*,[2] a majority of eight decided that the Constitution was violated when the Board of Education of Champaign, Illinois, made provisions for a short weekly period of religious instruction to be given during school hours to children whose parents requested that they be permitted to attend these classes. The instruction available during the school year 1945–1946 was either Roman Catholic, Jewish, Protestant or Interdenominational, the instructors being provided at no expense to the Board of Education by the religious groups concerned.

The debate over these cases has been understandably intense because the decisions, with startling suddenness, cast a solid cloud of uncertainty not only over the plans and desires of many religious groups but also over some of the relationships between church and government that have been developing in the United States during the course of several decades. Concern and confusion over the meaning of the "establishment of religion" clause stems in great part from confusion within the Supreme Court. The seven opinions written in these two cases—two majority, two concurring and three dissenting—reveal a wide divergence of views regarding the basic spirit and scope of the clause. More than that, there clearly seems to be disagreement among the Justices concerning the extent to which the Court should go in defining and enforcing the limitations of the First Amendment.[3] The present task of the Court is considerably complicated by the fact that for over a century and a half the clause in question had gone virtually unnoticed. Even in the few cases where it previously had come to the attention of the Court, it received only cursory treatment. With the passage of time the intentions of the framers of the Amendment have become obscured and a variety of attitudes and traditions have arisen to confuse the accepted meaning of the clause—if, indeed, they do not raise doubts as to the very existence of an accepted meaning. Under the circumstances, the spirit of the "establishment" clause has become a matter of considerable controversy, particularly regarding its application to situations which the framers could not have foreseen.

---

[1] 330 U. S. 1 (1947).

[2] 333 U. S. 203 (1948).

[3] See Justice Jackson's remarks in 333 U. S. at 237.

The *Everson* and *McCollum* decisions have by no means settled the bounds of the First Amendment. Instead, these cases will undoubtedly stimulate much litigation and the Court is still in a position which leaves it free to follow a variety of courses in the further development of the clause. The concern now is that the future course chosen be a wise one in terms of the Court's function in our constitutional government. This article is the result of a search for official interpretations of the clause that have been followed in the various branches of the federal government—interpretations that might serve as a guide for the future. If such guides as this search reveals seem unsatisfactory, should the Court then make of the clause what it thinks a dominant majority of the people want today? Or should the Court, in the role of an oracle, explain and apply the tradition that has developed regarding church-state relations in the United States? This last course of action would be justifiable if the content of the tradition were sufficiently precise to serve as the basis for judicial action. If such a tradition cannot be clearly defined, the Court might do well to regard the matter of church-state relations as one which in large measure has become a question of legislative rather than of constitutional policy, the settlement of which ought to be left in the hands of the legislatures and the people. Such a course of action is not unknown to the Court, which has studiously avoided any applicable definition of "a republican form of government" as involving a political, not a judicial, question.

Chief Justice Marshall could have had the First Amendment in mind when he pointed to the flexibility of our Constitution and to the fact that it was intended to be "adapted to the various *crises* in human affairs."[4] But adapted by whom? This question has not been settled, and one of the crucial aspects of the present controversy involves the circumstances under which, and the extent to which, the Court should participate in constitutional adaptation.

II

The controversy over the "establishment" clause begins with its very wording: "*Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion.*" No one doubts that this clause prevents Congress from establishing a church such as was known, at the time of the adoption of the Amendment, in England, where the Episcopal Church was recognized as the official church, the only one entitled to public financial support and recognition and the one to which all members of the government were required to belong. But is the clause to be so narrowly interpreted? Evidence contemporary with the adoption of the Amendment suggests that it was intended to be construed more broadly and that it prohibited more than merely those laws of establishment known to contemporary England.

If we assume that the framers of the First Amendment used words carefully, it is easy to see that the Amendment might well mean more than just a prohibition on establishing a national church in the British sense. A law respecting

---

[4] 4 Wheaton 415 (1819).

an establishment of *religion* has more comprehensive connotations than a law respecting *the* establishment of a *church.* If the framers of the Amendment meant to prohibit Congress merely from the establishment of a "church," one may properly wonder why they didn't so state. That the words *church* and *religion* were regarded as synonymous seems highly improbable, particularly in view of the fact that the contemporary state constitutional provisions dealing with the subject of establishment used definite phrases such as "religious sect," "sect," or "denomination."[5] Not one used the more inclusive word *religion.* In fact, the use of the word *religion* probably was consciously avoided, for while some state constitutions specifically prohibited a preference for or an establishment of any sect they just as specifically placed the religions of Christianity or of Protestantism in a preferred position.[6] With such specific wording in contemporary state constitutions, why was not a similar wording adopted for the First Amendment if its framers intended to prohibit nothing more than what the States were prohibiting? Indeed, concern over the use of the word "religion" was expressed when the House of Representatives, on August 15, 1789, was considering a proposal to amend Article I, section 9, by inserting between paragraphs two and three the provision that "No religion shall be established by law, nor shall the equal rights of conscience be infringed." Mr. Sylvester objected to the wording because "he feared it might be thought to have a tendency to abolish religion altogether."[7] In brief, *church* has a more sectarian connotation than *religion*, and the prevention of the establishment of a church means that no particular sect may be established. The prohibition of a law respecting "an establishment of religion," on the other hand, can by contrast logically be interpreted as prohibiting state aid and encouragement to any and all systems of belief concerned with the relation of man to the supernatural.

The possibility that the word *religion* was intentionally selected in preference to *church* or *any sect* finds further support in the fact that such a wording would be more appropriate to and consistent with the views of those who espoused Deism. The extent to which Deism may have been an influence can only be conjectured, but we do know that Deism had a widespread following in the United States at the time of the framing and adoption of the First Amendment.[8] It was a belief with admittedly political ramifications, which explains in part its attractiveness in the post-revolutionary days. At a time when people were thinking of liberty, Deism was a convenient rationale for freeing the individual and society from ecclesiastical domination. In some quarters ecclesiastical control meant more than just an interference with one's own beliefs—it was understood to be a potential instrument by which the lower classes could be kept in subjection. Deism provided the avenue to freedom from clericalism by denying the divinity of Christ and the Bible as the revealed word of God and by asserting that religion was entirely a matter of reason with each individual capable of knowing God without the aid of any intermediary in the form of a clerical hierarchy or without participation in church services. Deism was thus not only a highly individualistic belief but also one which in the extreme position would argue against any government support of religion *per se.*

---

[5] See the constitutions of Delaware (1776), Art. 29; Massachusetts (1780), Art. 23; New Hampshire (1784), Art. 1, sec. 6; New Jersey (1776), Art. 19; and North Carolina (1776), Art. 34. Georgia's constitution of 1790 provided in Article 9, sec. 3, that "no preference shall ever be given by law to any religious establishments or modes of worship."

[6] See the constitutions of Massachusetts (1780), New Hampshire (1784), New Jersey (1776) and North Carolina (1776).

[7] *Annals of Congress,* Vol. 1, p. 757.

[8] See G. Adolph Koch, *Republican Religion: The American Revolution and the Cult of Religion* (New York, 1933); and Herbert M. Morais, *Deism in Eighteenth Century America* (New York, 1934).

Among the known or probable Deists in the early 1790's were Jefferson, Franklin and John Adams.[9] Even among the non-Deists there were many like Washington and Madison who were classified as Free-thinkers—men who entertained a more than average degree of scepticism on such matters as the divinity of Christ and the Bible as the revelation of God's word. Nor were such beliefs at this time confined to the aristocracy. Koch observed that "The decade of the 1790's had left the clergy almost without exception in a hysterical condition. It was not a matter of Arminianism, Calvinism, or Catholicism, but religion itself that was on trial and its very existence seriously threatened."[10] In short, Deism and free thought had a sufficiently wide following in the 1790's to make them a significant factor in the politics of that time. In the presidential campaign of 1800 the Federalists made much of Jefferson's deistic tendencies. And pertinent to our inquiry is the following observation:

> There is evidence that, outside of New England, the "great" were guilty of more than usual "open neglect" of church attendance and of "the chief duties" of religion during the decade of the 1790's. The Rev. Ashbel Green, of the Second Presbyterian Church of Philadelphia and one of the chaplains of Congress for eight years from 1792, complained of the thin attendance of members of Congress at prayers. He attributed the usual absence of two-thirds of the members to the prevalence of free-thinking.[11]

An analysis of the various forms for the First Amendment proposed and discussed in Congress does not answer the question at hand. Instead it adds to the wonder as to the intended scope of the Amendment. The proposal that Congress "shall make no laws touching religion" was discarded.[12] At the same time James Madison made the proposal, cast in quite specific language, that "no national religion shall be established by law."[13] Madison withdrew this proposal when support was not forthcoming. In brief, the wording of the Amendment is less clear than some of the rejected wordings.

Thus far attention has been directed to the significance of the word "religion" in the Amendment. Can the word "establish" be a key to the proper interpretation of the scope of the Amendment? The problem would be simple if the verb *establish* could be shown to have had only one connotation in 1791 when used in connection with church-state relations. Yet while *establish* as used in England seems to have had reference to specific legal aspects of church-state relations, and to have included no more, in the States at the time of the adoption of the First Amendment the word was understood to apply to a wider scope of governmental activity. For example, an interesting use of the verb *establish* is found in the "Address to the People of Great Britain" by the first Continental Congress. This address contained a criticism of the Quebec Act of 1774, in which provision was made for the payment of tithes to the Catholic clergy in accordance with the practice of the French regime in Canada. By the terms of the Act, Protestants in Quebec were exempted definitely from this payment. Nevertheless, the Address asserted "That we think the Legislature of *Great-Britain* is not authorized by the Constitution to establish a Religion fraught with sanguinary and impious Tenets, or, to erect an arbitrary Form of Government in any quarter of the Globe."[14] And towards the end of an "Address to the British Colonies in America" the Quebec Act was characterised by the same Congress as an Act by which the "Roman Catholic Religion, instead of being tolerated, as stipulated by the Treaty of Peace, is established."[15]

---

[9] See Morais, *op. cit.*, pp. 92 and 113.

[10] Koch, *op. cit.*, p. 269.

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 84, footnote.

[12] *Annals of Congress*, Vol. 1, p. 759.

[13] *Ibid.*, pp. 758–759.

To denounce the Quebec Act as an *establishment of the Catholic Church* certainly leaves one in doubt. The doubt is not relieved when one reads in the *Annals* that when the previously mentioned proposal to amend Article I, section 9, was being discussed Mr. Huntington

> said that he feared, with the gentlemen first up on this subject, that the words might be taken in such latitude as to be extremely hurtful to the cause of religion. . . . The ministers of their congregations to the Eastward were maintained by the contributions of those who belonged to their society; the expense of building meeting-houses was contributed in the same manner. These things were regulated by by-laws. If an action was brought before a Federal Court on any of these cases, the person who had neglected to perform his engagements could not be compelled to do it; for a support of ministers, or building of places of worship might be construed as a religious establishment.[16]

Either Mr. Huntington was utterly ridiculous in imagining that a court judgment requiring a man to pay his financial obligation to a church society could be construed as establishing a religion by law, or, as is more likely, he merely reflected the general uncertainty of his contemporaries as to just what constituted an establishment of religion. There is, in fact, considerable evidence that when talking on the matter of severing church-state relations, the people in 1790 were thinking in terms of the relations then obtaining in the colonies—best characterized by the term "multiple establishment" and quite different from the contemporary "establishment" in England.[17] The "multiple establishment" relationship was characterized by a tendency to accept Protestantism as the official religion, if any official religion were chosen, and *not* to give preference to any one sect within Protestantism. Some states also provided for the collection from all people of tithes in the forms of taxes, the funds so collected to be turned over to the church designated by the taxpayer. In some instances it was provided that, if the taxpayer did not specify a church, the money received from him was then to be used for the support of the local almshouse.

---

[14] *Journals of Congress* (Philadelphia, 1777), p. 39.

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 53.

[16] *Annals of Congress*, Vol. 1, p. 758.

[17] The development of the system of "multiple establishment" has been well explained by R. Freeman Butts in his *American Tradition in Religion and Education* (Boston, 1950), Chs. 2 and 3.

By 1790 the colonists had, for the most part, already eliminated the essential features of the British establishment. Therefore, in urging further and more complete severance of church-state relations, they could have been thinking only of the abolition of multiple establishments, in which the power of government was used to assist several or all sects equally. When thinking of preventing the establishment of religion by law they were, according to this argument, choosing words to prevent what was then going on. They wished to prevent equal treatment of all sects by the government. The "Bill Establishing a Provision for Teachers of the Christian Religion," which was proposed in Virginia in 1784, was framed in terms of the system of church-state relations just described. It was against this proposed bill that James Madison wrote his famous *Memorial and Remonstrance*, in which he made frequent use of the word *establish* to refer to the objectionable features of the bill.

III

Contemporary evidence indicates that the First Amendment almost certainly was intended to prohibit more than merely the designation by Congress of a particular sect as the official church of the government. However, this conclusion gives little indication of the full extent of the prohibition. Evidence on this score is by no means clear, and during the century and a half following the adoption of the Amendment national sentiment regarding the outer limits of the prohibited area of governmental action has only gradually taken form. It has not even yet become settled with regard to certain aspects of church-state relations.

Time and custom have long since overruled the beliefs of Jefferson and Madison that presidential proclamations of national days of prayer and religious observance were contrary to the Constitution. And subsequent generations have rebelled at the completeness of the separation between church and state implied in Article XI of the treaty of 1796 with Tripoli which, with the approval of President Washington and the Senate, stated:

> As the government of the United States of America is not, in any sense, founded on the Christian religion—as it has in itself no character of enmity against the laws, religion or tranquility, of Musselmen—and as the said States never have entered into any war or act of hostility against any Mahometan nation, it is declared by the parties, that no pretext arising from religious opinions shall ever produce an interruption of the harmony existing between the two countries.[18]

When the Kentucky legislature, saturated with Deists, abolished the office of chaplain in 1793 on the ground that the office constituted a forbidden form of establishment, it took an extreme stand that custom has long since denied.[19] Yet doubts on the constitutionality of the office of chaplain remained, at least in some quarters, and found expression in the early 1850's in the form of petitions to Congress for the abolition of the offices of chaplain in the armed forces and Houses of Congress on the grounds of the First Amendment. The petitions were not dismissed as unworthy of attention, but were referred to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, which examined the constitutional question in a special report.[20]

---

[18] *Statutes at Large*, Vol. 8, p. 155.

[19] Morais, *op. cit.*, p. 158.

An early opportunity to clarify the scope of the prohibition of the First Amendment came before Congress in February of 1811, when President Madison vetoed two bills because they violated the establishment of religion clause. The President objected to the first bill, which provided for the incorporation of the Protestant Episcopal Church of Alexandria into the District of Columbia, on the grounds that by enacting into law "sundry rules and proceedings relative purely to the organization and policy of the church incorporated . . . [this] particular church, therefore, would so far be a religious establishment by law; a legal force and sanction being given to certain articles in its constitution and administration."[21] Further, he believed that by authorizing the incorporated church to "provide for the support of the poor and the education of poor children," the bill "would be a precedent for giving to religious societies as such a legal agency in carrying into effect a public and civil duty." To the second bill, which provided in section six for a grant of five acres of public land in New Salem, Louisiana Territory, to the local Baptist Church, the President objected that it "comprises a principle and precedent, for the appropriation of funds of the United States, for the use and support of religious societies; contrary to the article of the Constitution which declares that Congress shall make no law respecting a religious establishment [sic]."[22] The *Annals* do not show any debate on these bills before they were sent to the President, nor after their return was there enlightening discussion of the constitutional question involved. The first bill was returned with the President's veto message on February 21, 1811. After the reading of the message, Mr. Pitkin is reported by the *Annals* to have remarked——

> that this question was new to him. He had no idea that the Constitution precluded Congress from passing laws to incorporate religious societies for the purpose of enabling them to hold property, etc. He had always held the Constitution to intend to prevent the establishment of a National Church, such as the Church of England—a refusal to subscribe to the tenets of which was to exclude a citizen from office, etc.[23]

But the President's message may have thrown him into doubts on the constitutional issue, for, according to the *Annals*, "Desiring time for reflection, he therefore wished the bill to lie on the table for further consideration." Mr. Pickman followed these remarks by expressing the opinion that the bill was not an important one "a refusal to pass which would be productive of any serious injury; and yet, *that a full discussion of the principles it involved would occupy the whole of the remainder of the session*."[24] The bill was tabled, and when brought up two days later it failed to pass over the President's veto by a vote of 29 to 74.

The second bill was returned to the House of Representatives with the veto message on March 1, and failed of passage over the veto by a vote of 33 to 55. On the following day, however, with the objectionable section six deleted, it was reintroduced and passed. The recorded proceedings of the House of Representatives after the return of these two bills may be interpreted either as congressional acquiescence in presidential interpretation of the constitutional issue, as indifference to the subject matter of the bills, or as evidence of widespread doubt regarding the proper scope of the Amendment. Perhaps it was felt at that late date that the time necessary for a proper discussion of the issue should not be allocated from the few remaining days of the session. However that may be, the fact remains that the ambiguity in the Amendment was by no means clarified by congressional vote or debate.

---

[20] *Senate Report*, 376, 32nd Cong., 2nd Sess.
[21] *Annals of Congress*, Vol. 22, p. 983.
[22] *Ibid.*, p. 1098.
[23] *Ibid.*, p. 984.
[24] *Idem.* Italics supplied.

In the famous *Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States,* which Justice Story wrote in 1833, almost ten pages were devoted to a discussion of the establishment of religion clause. Considering his prominence as a constitutional authority of the time, it is significant that his discussion does not give a very precise elaboration of the clause but instead confines itself to general statements regarding its broad purposes and the problem of church-state relations. The significance of what he wrote lies in the attitudes he reflects regarding church and state. He opened his discussion by pointing to the fact that "how far any government has a right to interfere in matters touching religion, has been a subject much discussed by writers upon public and political law." It was his opinion that "at all events, it is impossible for those, who believe in the truth of Christianity, as a divine revelation, to doubt, that it is the especial duty of government to foster, and encourage it among all the citizens and subjects."[25] Further, he felt that "there will probably be found few persons in this, or any other Christian country, who would deliberately contend, that it was unreasonable, or unjust to foster and encourage the Christian religion generally, as a matter of sound policy, as well as of revealed truth."[26] With specific respect to the "establishment" clause he commented:

> *Probably* at the time of the adoption of the Constitution, and of the amendment to it, now under consideration, the general, if not the universal, sentiment in America was, that Christianity *ought to receive encouragement from the state, so far as was not incompatible* with the private rights of conscience, and the freedom of religious worship. An attempt to level all religions, and to make it a matter of state policy to hold all in utter indifference, would have created universal disapprobation, if not universal indignation.[27]

It was Story's view that the object of the Amendment was to eliminate rivalry among Christian sects and thus to remove the means of religious persecution.

But while Justice Story was persuaded that as a matter of constitutional policy the American people favored the encouragement of Christianity, he was obviously dubious as to the permissible action which government could take on the matter of religion. He was not even precise in his use of the term *establishment* when he wrote:

> The real difficulty lies in ascertaining the limits, to which government may rightfully

---

[25] *Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States* (Boston, 1833), Vol. 3, sec. 1865.

[26] *Ibid.,* sec. 1867.

[27] *Ibid.,* sec. 1868.

> go in fostering and encouraging religion. Three cases may easily be supposed. One, where a government affords aid to a particular religion, leaving all persons free to adopt any other; another, where it creates an ecclesiastical establishment for the propagation of the doctrines of a particular sect of that religion, leaving a like freedom to all others; and a third, where it creates such an establishment, and excludes all persons, not belonging to it, either wholly, or in part, from any participation in the public honours, trusts, emoluments, privileges, and immunities of the state.[28]

In brief, he understood that the Amendment called for a rather extensive severance of connections between church and state as being advisable for both the federal *and* the state governments:

> It was under a solemn consciousness of the dangers from ecclesiastical ambition, the bigotry of spiritual pride, and the intolerance of sects, thus exemplified in our domestic, as well as in foreign annals, that it was deemed advisable to *exclude from the national government all power to act upon the subject. The situation, too, of the different states equally proclaimed the policy, as well as the necessity of such an exclusion.*[29]

Without saying how far the national government was excluded, he implied that the exclusion was greater than had ever before been attempted in the history of the world:

> It yet remains a problem to be solved in human affairs, whether any free government can be permanent, where the public worship of God, and the support of religion, constitute no part of the policy or duty of the state in any assignable shape. The future experience of Christendom, and chiefly of the American states, must settle this problem, as yet new in the history of the world, abundant, as it has been, in experiments in the theory of government.[30]

Apparently the earliest concise expression to come from a government agency concerning the meaning of the "establishment" clause is found in a report of the Senate Judiciary Committee in 1853. That short, four-page report was written by the Committee after a study of petitions requesting the abolition of the office of chaplain in the armed forces and in the Houses of Congress on the ground that the creation of those offices by law had constituted a violation of the "establishment" clause. It was the opinion of the Committee that the clause was to be interpreted in terms of the system known in England in 1790. The clause, wrote the Committee—

> referred, without doubt, to that establishment which existed in the mother country, and its meaning is to be ascertained by ascertaining what that establishment was. It was the connexion with the state of a particular religious society, by its endowment, at the public expense, in exclusion of, or in preference to, any other, by giving to its members exclusive political rights, and by compelling the attendance of those who rejected its communion upon its worship, or religious observances. These three particulars constituted that union of church and state of which our ancestors were so justly jealous, and against which they so wisely and carefully provided.[31]

But it does not seem to have been the opinion of the Committee that a complete system of establishment as known in England in the 18th century was necessary in order to violate the First Amendment. For, the Committee continued:

---

[28] *Ibid.*, sec. 1866.

[29] *Ibid.*, sec. 1873. Italics supplied.

[30] *Ibid.*, sec. 1869.

[31] *Senate Report* 376, 32nd Cong., 2nd Sess., p. 1.

> If Congress has passed, or should pass, any law which, fairly construed, has in any degree introduced, or should attempt to introduce, in favor of any church, or ecclesiastical association, or system of religious faith, all or any one of these obnoxious particulars—endowment at the public expense, peculiar privileges to its members, or disadvantages or penalties upon those who should reject its doctrines or belong to other communions—such law would be a "law respecting an establishment of religion," and, therefore, in violation of the constitution. But no law yet passed by Congress is justly liable to such an objection.[32]

Before concluding, the Committee expressed the interesting opinion that the petitioners might have been in a stronger legal position had they petitioned against Sunday observance laws. In deciding that the office of chaplain did not violate the constitution, the Committee buttressed its constitutional interpretation with an argument drawn from tradition and acceptance. Pointing out that if the claim of the petitioners were constitutionally correct it would have been recognized by the men in Congress at the time of the adoption of the First Amendment, the Committee concluded:

> What met the approval of our Washington, and of all the great men who have succeeded him; what commands the general commendation of people; what is at once so venerable and so lovely, so respectable and respected—ought not, in the opinion of the committee, now to be discontinued.[33]

If there were not at this time a universally accepted understanding of the prohibitions of the "establishment of religion" clause, at least there had developed by tradition certain acceptable church-state relations. Not only were the services of chaplains in the federal government considered permissible but also were such matters as the designation of national days of prayer and thanksgiving and the enactment of Sunday observance laws regarded as appropriate subjects for presidential proclamations and legislative action. Furthermore, Justice Story in his *Commentaries* of 1833 apparently did not voice a minority view when he assumed a special intimacy between the American people and their government on the one hand and Christianity—more particularly Protestantism, which he regarded as the religion of liberty—on the other. The Justice took advantage of the opportunity to put the stamp of official approval on this preference for Christianity when in the case of Mr. Girard's will, he wrote in the opinion for a unanimous Court:

> It is also said, and truly, that the Christian religion is a part of the common law of Pennsylvania. . . .
>
> It is unnecessary for us, however, to consider what would be the legal effect of a devise in Pennsylvania for the establishment of a school or college, for the propagation of Judaism, or Deism, or any other form of infidelity. Such a case is not to be presumed to exist in a Christian country.[34]

During the 1870's there was an opportunity to bring about a clarification on a national scale of the matter of separation of church and state, but it passed without producing any concrete development in American constitutional policy. In 1863 the belief that the Civil War was an expression of Divine displeasure against the nation resulted in the call to a convention at Xenia, Ohio, for prayer and Christian conference with special reference to the state of the nation. As an outgrowth of this conference, the National Association to Secure the Religious Amendment to the Constitution of the United States was organized in 1864. The basic purpose of this group was to secure amendatory clauses in the preamble and other appropriate places in the federal Constitution that would acknowledge God, Jesus Christ and the Bible as the fountain of law and good morals, as well as of religion. In 1867 the Honorable William Strong, later Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court, was elected president of the Association and he outlined its objectives in the calls to the 1872 and 1873 conventions. In 1872 he deplored the fact that the Constitution makes no acknowledgement of God and the Bible, and thus—

---

[32] *Ibid.*, pp. 1–2. [33] *Ibid.*, p. 4.

[34] *Vidal et al. v. Girard's Executors*, 2 Howard 127, 198 (1844).

> has fostered among us mischievous ideas like the following: The nation, as such, has no relations to God; its authority has no higher source than the will of the people; government is instituted only for the lower wants of man; the State goes beyond its sphere when it educates religiously, or legislates against profanity or Sabbath desecration.[35]

At about this time actions initiated on constitutional grounds were eliminating Bible reading in the public schools of several states. In 1873 Justice Story declared that this matter "and many similar questions, are now demanding attention and decisive settlement." It is clear that Justice Strong considered the current attacks on Bible reading in the schools, Sabbath laws and anti-polygamy laws as justified under existing constitutional provisions. Those who assail legislation, such as Sabbath laws, "on the ground of their inconsistency with the Constitution of the United States" must be met, he declared, "at their own point of attack." He explained further:

> The National Association has been formed for the purpose of securing such an amendment to the Constitution as will suitably acknowledge Almighty God as the author of the nation's existence and the ultimate source of its authority, Jesus Christ as its Ruler, and the Bible as the fountain of its laws, and thus indicate that this is a Christian nation, and place all Christian laws, institutions, and usages in our government on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land.[36]

This was not a matter of tilting at windmills, for the National Association had real adversaries. Not only had the reading of the Bible in public schools been declared invalid in some states, but the President of the United States was taking a strong stand on the matter of sectarian education in the public schools. With a sincere belief that wise constitutional policy dictated a rather complete absence of religion in the schools, President Grant in his annual message to Congress in 1875 urged the proposal of an amendment to the Federal Constitution—

> making it the duty of each of the several States to establish and forever maintain free pub-

---

[35] *Proceedings of the National Convention to Secure the Religious Amendment of the Constitution of the United States* (Philadelphia, 1872), p. 2. This convention was held in Cincinnati on January 31 and February 1, 1872

[36] *Proceedings* . . . (Philadelphia, 1873), p. 2. This convention was held in New York City on February 26 and 27, 1873.

> lic schools adequate to the education of all the children in the rudimentary branches within their respective limits, irrespective of sex, color, birthplace, or religions; forbidding the teaching in said schools of religious, atheistic, or pagan tenets; and prohibiting the granting of any school funds, or school taxes, or any part thereof, either by legislative, municipal, or other authority, for the benefit or in aid, directly or indirectly, of any religious sect or denomination. . . ."[37]

Later in the same message he emphasized the need not only for the above amendment but also for legislation that would "Declare church and state forever separate and distinct, but each free within its proper sphere, and that all church property shall bear its own proportion of taxation."[38]

In urging this constitutional amendment President Grant was supported by the Republican Party Platforms of 1876 and 1880 and the Prohibition Party Platform of 1876.[39] In these two campaigns the Democratic Party affirmed its adherence to the "two-fold separation of church and state" and to the prohibition of any grant of public monies to any sect or creed, but it opposed the proposal of the Republicans as constituting an invasion of state powers and stimulating "sectarian strife in respect to the public schools."[40]

At a time when public attention was focused on the matter of sectarianism in the schools, Mr. Blaine introduced the following proposed amendment into the House of Representatives (on December 14, 1875):

> No State shall make any law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; and no money raised by taxation in any State for the support of public schools, or derived from any public fund therefor, nor any public lands devoted thereto, shall ever be under the control of any religious sect, nor shall any money so raised or lands so devoted be divided between religious sects or denominations.[41]

The amendment was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, from which it was reported favorably on August 4, 1876. The proposal had, however, been altered by the addition of the provision that "this article shall not vest, enlarge or diminish legislative power in the Congress." This change was made, said Mr. Hoar, to quiet fears that the amendment would enlarge federal powers. In this form the amendment passed the House by the overwhelming vote of 180 to 7.[42] On August 7 it was introduced into the Senate, where it was immediately referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. That committee recommended a substitute amendment which, for our purposes, differed from the House amendment on three points: the prohibition was extended to the use of *any* public funds, not just those funds specifically raised for school purposes; the amendment was made applicable to the federal government as well as to the states; and Congress was given power "by appropriate legislation, to provide for the prevention and punishment of violations of this article."[43] After considerable debate the Senate, by a vote of 27 to 15, accepted the substitution proposed by its committee. This action was taken on August 11; but the motion for the adoption of the Senate version of the amendment, put to the Senate on August 14, failed for want of a two-thirds majority, the vote being 28 to 16.

---

[37] *Congressional Record*, Vol. 4, p. 175. [38] *Ibid.*, p. 181.

[39] See Kirk H. Porter, *National Party Platforms* (New York, 1924), pp. 96, 110 and 93.

[40] *Ibid.*, pp. 86, 99, and 89. [41] *Congressional Record*, Vol. 4, p. 205.

[42] *Ibid.*, pp. 5189–5192.

[43] The Senate version can be found in *Congressional Record*, Vol. 4, p. 5453.

Such a variety of views and attitudes was expressed in the Senate debate that it is impossible to say why the proposal failed to attract the necessary four additional votes.[44] But the wording of the proposed amendment and the debates contain several matters of interest to us. In the first place, both the Senate and House versions opened by prohibiting the States from making "any law respecting an establishment of religion" and then went on to deal with the prohibition of the use of public funds for sectarian education. The inference is obvious that these were treated as two separate and mutually exclusive prohibitions. No one suggested that the first prohibition automatically included the second. In fact, Senator Christiancy who spoke and voted for the Senate version criticized the House version because:

> It simply prohibits the States from doing these things; it does not prohibit the United States; and under the Constitution of the United States, as it now stands, it is entirely competent to devote lands or impose taxes and appropriate money for sectarian purposes.[45]

A second point of interest is that the Senate version specifically provided that the prohibitions of the amendment "shall not be construed to prohibit the reading of the Bible in any school or institution." Finally, the debates show no disagreement over the principle of keeping public funds from sectarian education but only a disagreement over the methods for implementing that principle. It is to be noted that from the time of these debates onward Congress required new states admitted into the Union to have provisions in their constitutions covering the use of funds for sectarian purposes.[46]

Quite likely a major factor in the failure of the Blaine Amendment was a belief that it was unnecessary inasmuch as many of the state constitutions already contained similar prohibitions. Senator Randolph, who favored the House version, observed, nevertheless, that "upon many of the States it is of no additional effect, because they have already, in spirit, adopted amendments to their own constitutions of similar effect."[47] The problem of eliminating sectarian influence from the schools was by no means new. At the beginning of the public education system the inclusion of moral teaching, together with the reading of the Bible, recital of the Lord's Prayer, and singing of hymns, had been widely accepted as appropriate and advisable for the moral character of coming generations. However, in spite of professions of religious freedom,

---

[44] The fact that this proposed amendment was made an issue in the presidential campaign of 1876, and also that the Papal Encyclical of 1864 was brought into the senatorial debate by Senator Edmunds, gave the issue a partisan flavor and possibly caused the proposed amendment to lose some support in the Senate which it otherwise would have had.

[45] *Congressional Record*, Vol. 4, p. 5246.

[46] See *Statutes at Large*, Vol. 25, p. 677, for North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana and Washington; *Statutes at Large*, Vol. 28, p. 108, for Utah; *Statutes at Large*, Vol. 34, p. 270, for Oklahoma; and *Statutes at Large*, Vol. 36, pp. 559 and 570, for New Mexico and Arizona.

[47] *Congressional Record*, Vol. 4, p. 5455.

Americans have not always been above sectarian strife, as the story of the Protestant crusade in America reveals only too well.[48] By the 1850's considerable controversy had developed over the matter of religion in the schools—a controversy that was focusing attention on such questions as public aid to parochial schools and Bible reading in the public schools. This anti-sectarian move had for its objective the elimination of sectarian strife and jealousies by the simple device of denying to any sect an opportunity to use public funds or the public schools to promote its own doctrines. In brief, non-sectarianism was the only ground on which the sects could get together.[49] The movement of which the Blaine Amendment was merely a culminating expression was, then, by no means anti-Christian nor anti-religious, as Justice Strong and the Association to Secure the Religious Amendment to the Constitution of the United States seemed to think. In fact, eight years before the Senate debated the Blaine Amendment Thomas M. Cooley wrote in his famous *Constitutional Limitations:*

> Those things which are not lawful under any of the American constitutions may be stated thus:—
>
> 1. Any law respecting an establishment of religion.
> 2. Compulsory support, by taxation or otherwise, of religious instruction. Not only is no one denomination to be favored at the expense of the rest, but all support of religious instruction must be entirely voluntary.[50]

National sentiment at the time of the Blaine Amendment seems clearly to have been solidified on a few phases of church-state relations. Not only was there agreement on the points made by Cooley but also it seems to have become common to regard church and state in America as being separated as far as possible. Thus Theodore Woolsey, a Doctor of Divinity and past President of Yale University, writing on the various forms of church-state relations known to history concluded with—

> the last form of relation between church and state, that of complete separation, so far as separation can be complete where a certain degree of protection is required, the same kind and degree that would be necessary for maintaining rights in any secular sphere of action. *This is the plan that now runs through all the states of this union.*[51]

While the principle of separation was thus widely acknowledged in the United States, it was just as widely acknowledged that this was a Christian nation.[52] President Grant, in fighting sectarianism in education, also urged the

---

[48] See R. A. Billington, *The Protestant Crusade, 1800–1860* (New York, 1938).

[49] Senator Frelinghuysen in opposing the narrowness of the House version remarked: "We know that in one State within a decade $1,200,000 was voted Protestant institutions for which Catholics of the country were taxed, and we know that in the same period several millions of dollars were voted to Catholic institutions for which Protestants were taxed." *Congressional Record,* Vol. 4, p. 5245.

[50] Thomas M. Cooley, *Constitutional Limitations* (1st ed., Boston, 1868), p. 469.

[51] Theodore Woolsey, *Political Science; or, The State Theoretically and Practically Considered* (New York, 1877), Vol. 2, p. 467. Italics supplied.

[52] A number of statements to this effect are to be found in opinions of the United States Supreme Court. Justice David J. Brewer wrote a book entitled *The United States a Christian Nation* (Philadelphia, 1905).

banishment of polygamy, saying "That polygamy should exist in a free, enlightened, and *Christian country* without the power to punish so flagrant a crime against decency and morality seems preposterous."[53] Herein lies a difficulty in giving precision to the boundary between church and state; for any acknowledgment of governmental favoritism towards Christianity may at times seem inconsistent with the principle that the American state and church are to be separate. The national attention accorded the problem in the 1870's resulted in giving precision to only a segment of the boundary line. Since that time the problem and all proposed amendments related to it have received no significant nation-wide discussion.[54]

Prior to 1946 the "establishment" clause had received much less attention from the Supreme Court than it had from either the President or Congress. The only early case directly involving the clause was *Bradfield v. Roberts.*[55] That case involved an appropriation by Congress for the construction of hospital facilities in the District of Columbia, the money to be distributed by the Commissioners of the District. Pursuant to this Act the Commissioners allocated part of the funds for the construction of an isolation wing for a hospital that was operated by a group of Catholic nuns. It was sought to enjoin this use of public funds on the grounds that the allocation constituted a forbidden "law respecting the establishment of religion." In denying the injunction the Court avoided any elaboration on the meaning of the clause. Instead, the Court reached its decision by taking the position that the appropriation was being made to a hospital open to everyone. The fact that the hospital was operated by a religious society did not mean that the appropriation was for the benefit of that religion. From this reasoning, one can only infer that the injunction would have been issued had the funds been used directly or even indirectly to promote the doctrines of a particular sect. In short, this decision explained further what the amendment does not prohibit rather than what it does prohibit.

In only one other case did the Court have a clear opportunity to elaborate on the meaning of the "establishment" clause—an opportunity which it did not develop. That case was a suit by Quick Bear against Leupp, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, to enjoin the payment of money to the Bureau of Catholic Indian Missions for Catholic schools among the Sioux Indians.[56] Congress for some time had followed the policy of contracting with various religious groups to provide schooling among the Indians. This action was taken to fulfill the treaty obligations of the United States to provide education for the Indians. In the Quick Bear case the fact was emphasized that the funds used were drawn from a trust fund created for the Sioux Indians. Under the circumstances it was considered that Leupp was acting in what might be termed a private or quasi-private capacity as a trustee of the Indian funds. But Chief

---

[53] *Congressional Record,* Vol. 4, p. 180. Italics supplied.

[54] See Herman V. Ames, *Proposed Amendments to the Constitution,* House Document 353, Part 2, 54th Cong., 2nd Sess.; and M. A. Musmanno, *Proposed Amendments to the Constitution,* House Document 551, 70th Cong., 2nd Sess.

[55] 175 U. S. 291 (1899). [56] 210 U. S. 50 (1908).

Justice Fuller did vaguely indicate that had there been involved the use of public funds, rather than of trust funds, the action might have been unconstitutional.[57]

In all other cases where the "establishment" clause has been mentioned by the Court it has quickly been submerged in a general discussion of religious freedom.[58] Virtually nothing had been done by the Court in the way of developing the "establishment" clause as a separate clause prior to the *Everson* case. This noteworthy fact was emphasized by the selection of the issue in the case of *Cochran v. Louisiana State Board of Education,* where an attempt was made to prevent the state of Louisiana from purchasing non-sectarian textbooks and making them available to students in parochial schools.[59] Although the Court had, well prior to this suit, considered the Fourteenth Amendment as imposing upon the states the prohibitions of the First Amendment, counsel for Cochran chose to contest this action of Louisiana not on the grounds of the "establishment" clause but on the grounds that it constituted a forbidden deprivation of private property for a private use contrary to the due process clause. On this issue the Court upheld the Louisiana action. In so doing it followed a line of reasoning similar to that used in the *Bradfield* case: the appropriation of tax funds was for a public purpose and the fact that the educational institution was operated by members of a particular sect did not change the character of the appropriation. The implication here, as in the *Bradfield* case, is that the appropriation, had it been devoted to sectarian purposes, would have been prohibitable because used for non-public purposes.

In contrast to the federal courts, the state courts have been faced with a substantial amount of litigation dealing with the problem of church-state relations.[60] While virtually every state has had constitutional provisions to prohibit sectarian education in particular and to deal in general with the separation of church and state, we yet find considerable variation in the application of general principles to concrete situations.[61] The reading of the King James version of the Bible in public schools has been regarded as non-sectarian in some states but as sectarian and prohibitable in other states. Use of public funds for transporting children to parochial schools and for providing textbooks in these schools has received similarly varied interpretations. Where a local parochial school has become the sole school in the district, and, by agreement with the local school board, has been supported out of public funds as though it were the public school, although remaining under the control of the church, the system has been invalidated in some states and upheld in others.[62]

---

[57] *Ibid.*, p. 81.

[58] For example see *Reynolds v. United States,* 98 U. S. 145 (1878).

[59] 281 U. S. 370 (1930).

[60] See William G. Torpey, *Judicial Doctrines of Religious Rights in America* (Chapel Hill, 1948) for a discussion of numerous state court decisions on various aspects of sectarianism in the schools.

[61] In a note on "Catholic Schools and Public Money" the authors observed that: "By 1938 only Vermont lacked at least one constitutional provision capable of limiting the grant of public funds for Catholic, or other sectarian, education. The phraseology of the provisions varies, but seven generic types are distinguishable: prohibition (1) against the use of public school funds for any purpose other than the support of common schools; (2) against any grant or appropriation of money, property, or credit of the state to educational institutions not under the exclusive control of the state; (3) upon the appropriation of public funds for any sectarian purpose, society, or institution; (4) denying state aid to educational institutions controlled by a sectarian denomination; (5) denying state aid to sectarian schools; (6) denying state aid to private schools; (7) upon appropriations of public money for any school in which a sectarian doctrine is taught. There are, in addition, miscellaneous groups of provisions, as well as statutes in some of the forms suggested." *Yale Law Journal,* Vol. 50, pp. 920–921 (1941).

Along with these varied views there has been the growing feeling in many communities that the proper moral training of the school children cannot adequately be given merely through the family and available church classes on Sunday. In consequence, two systems have evolved for providing religious instruction during the week with the cooperation of the boards of education.[63] The earlier one to develop was the "dismissed time" system whereby the schools dismissed the children earlier than usual on one day a week so that those whose parents so desired, could attend religious classes in their own churches. In some quarters, at least, this arrangement was found to be impractical because either the churches were so far from the schools as to make the attendance unduly burdensome to the child or truancy was so high as to render the system obviously ineffective. There then grew up a system known as the "released time" system which, in varying forms, involved an agreement with the school board for the release of children during school hours for a certain period each week, at which time those whose parents so desired could receive sectarian instruction of their choice in the school rooms by non-public school teachers. Some school districts which have tried one or the other of these forms of religious education have abandoned the attempt altogether. With some 2,000 school districts still using some form of released or dismissed time system in 1947 there was ample evidence that, whatever else it might mean, the American tradition of separation of church and state did not signify to the majority of the people in those districts that the power of government could not be used in an indirect and incidental way to promote religious instruction in the sect of one's choice.

In conclusion, a quick survey of the problem of church-state relations up to 1946 does not carry us very far toward discovering a detailed definition of the American tradition of the separation of church and state. Perhaps we should not be surprised, for as Evarts B. Greene noted:

> What has been called the American tradition of the separation of church and state was . . . far from bèing universally accepted at the close of the Revolutionary War. That result, with certain qualifications to be considered later, was the outcome of another half century of experience and public discussion. In this further advance the honor of leadership belongs to Virginia.[64]

A survey does reveal, however, the development of some basic principles and attitudes that have a bearing on the problem of interpreting the "establishment" clause. It is clear that the clause was regarded by many, shortly after its adoption, as prohibiting more than the creation of an established church such as then existed in England. In most of the discussion, the "establishment" clause was considered in connection with the principle of religious freedom, as though establishment of religion and the free exercise of religion were to be taken together as jointly embodying the principle of separation of church and state. The result has been an unquestioned acceptance of the general proposition that government shall neither be used to discriminate against a sect nor be controlled by nor used for the promotion of a particular sect. Provisions against the use of public funds for sectarian instruction or other similar purposes are to be understood as an implementation of this proposition. This position was well expressed, with perhaps some historical inaccuracies, by Jeremiah S. Black in 1856 when he wrote in his essay on Religious Liberty:

---

[62] For example see *State ex rel Johnson v. Boyd*, 28 N. E. (2nd) 256 (Indiana, 1940), and *Harfst v. Hoegen*, 163 S. W. (2nd) 609 (Missouri, 1942).

[63] See Alvin W. Johnson and Frank H. Yost, *Separation of Church and State in the United States* (Minneapolis, 1948).

[64] Evarts B. Greene, *Religion and the State* (New York, 1941), p. 85.

> The manifest object of the men who framed the institutions of this country, was to have a *State without religion*, and a *Church without politics*—that is to say, they meant that one should never be used as an engine for any purpose of the other. . . . Our fathers seem to have been perfectly sincere in their belief that the members of the Church would be more patriotic, and the citizens of the State more religious, by keeping their respective functions entirely separate. For that reason they built up a wall of complete and perfect partition between the two.[65]

Concurrent with the emergence of this doctrine, however, has been the adoption of legislation and the acceptance of judicial decisions which give government support to some of the basic principles of Christianity. Hence an obvious conclusion: the American principle of separation does not prohibit all forms of governmental aid to religion, but rather contains a distinction between permissible and prohibitable aid.

IV

To return to the questions raised at the outset regarding constitutional interpretation, an examination of the intentions of the framers of the First Amendment and of the customary practices and attitudes that relate to church-state relations does not provide a simple and direct answer to the many legal problems that may well come before the Court in the future. In some respects American thought and action have vacillated and have even given rise to the existence of apparently contradictory policies. Where such has been the case, the matters belong in the realm of legislative rather than constitutional policy and are thus beyond the province of the judiciary to settle. But throughout the development of American constitutional thought certain basic principles regarding church-state relations have emerged and the recognition of these as part of the First Amendment and their application to concrete problems is clearly the responsibility of the judiciary.

The Court could avoid the problem of passing upon the validity of state action were it to declare that the "establishment of religion" clause does *not* apply to the states by way of the Fourteenth Amendment. This course of action was strongly urged in appellee's brief in the *McCollum* case; and historically there are sound grounds for so holding, inasmuch as the framers—whatever else they may have intended by the clause—intended to limit only the federal government. (In fact, by their silence, they seem clearly to have intended that the individual states could deal with religion as they pleased.) Such a decision, however, would be both unwise and impossible at this time, for the Court, having already gone too far in holding the First Amendment to be a part of the Fourteenth Amendment, cannot now recant. Indeed, it is doubtful whether many who quarrel with the *McCollum* decision would actually welcome a step which could mean the freedom of states to alter their constitutions, to adopt an official church and to permit units of local government to give preferential treatment to a particular sect. Further, this course could lead to an absurd situation, unless the "establishment" and "free exercise" provisions of the First Amendment were both to be held inapplicable to the states. To hold that the states are limited by the "free exercise" provision but not by the "establishment" provision would mean that local religious minorities have federal protection against oppressive state action, but that there is no federal hindrance to a local religious majority's using its position to obtain local preferential treatment.

---

[65] Chauncey F. Black, *Essays and Speeches of Jeremiah S. Black* (New York, 1886), p. 53.

The argument to the effect that the individual is protected from state action by only a part of the religious provisions of the Federal Constitution is based on a questionable reading of the words "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." The "establishment" provision is so intimately related to the "free exercise" provision that the two must be read together as a unit—a unit which cannot logically be separated. The ultimate object of each phrase is the same: to prevent a religious majority from using its political power to its own advantage, either through outright oppression of the minority or through direct governmental assistance. It is this ultimate objective that has been accepted as a part of the Fourteenth Amendment, and the Court in the *Everson* case quite properly refused to separate these two provisions of the First Amendment. But to say that the Court can not go back on the Fourteenth Amendment does not mean that it is free to go forward as it chooses in its elaboration of the First Amendment.

In the application of the First Amendment to the *Everson* and *McCollum* situations, the members of the Court chose an unsupportable position which was crucial to the arguments in both cases. When Justice Black wrote in the majority opinion for the *Everson* decision that the First Amendment "means at least this: Neither a state nor the Federal Government . . . can pass laws which aid . . . all religions," he expressed an opinion that was reiterated not only in his *McCollum* opinion but also in each of the concurring and dissenting opinions connected with the two cases.[66] Yet this is an extreme position which cannot be maintained. In fact the *Everson* decision itself, by allowing grants of public funds to pay for the transportation of children to parochial schools, was not consistent with this position. Schools which have as one of their primary objectives the promotion of the doctrines of a particular sect are certainly aided in that objective by the use of public funds to transport the children to and from school. Both the "released time" and "dismissed time" systems also constitute aid to religion. In both instances the educational system of the state is being accommodated to the furtherance of religion, and certainly under the "dismissed time" and under some forms of the "released time" system the power of government, by requiring attendance at a religious class and by punishing truancy, is brought to bear—as indeed it is intended to bear—upon students whose parents desire their attendance for sectarian instruction. At the very least the competition of religion with the playground, workshop or corner movie is minimized, if not entirely eliminated, through the cooperation of the school. That this required attendance is aid there can be no question. But that is not the important point. Tax exemption is also aid, as is any governmental action that makes it financially easier for children to attend parochial schools or for people to deduct gifts to churches from their incomes for tax purposes. The basic question which requires an answer is: What is prohibitable aid?

---

[66] See Justice Jackson in 330 U. S. 27; Justice Rutledge in 330 U. S. 32; Justice Frankfurter in 333 U. S. 231; and Justice Reed in 333 U. S. 248.

The answer to this crucial question is to be found in the combined effect of the "establishment" and "free exercise" provisions of the First Amendment. The governmental limitations imposed by those provisions at the present stage of American constitutional development can be briefly summarized. No sect or religion may be designated as the official church of the government. No legislation may be passed which gives preferential treatment to a particular sect or denomination or which involves religious discrimination or oppression. The use of public funds for the support of an institution is prohibited if an essential objective of the institution is the advancement of sectarian doctrine. Finally, legislation which creates such a relationship between government and a particular sect or sects as to enable the one to control the other and thereby use the other for its own ends, is clearly prohibited by the Constitution.

In view of the above stated limitations imposed by the First Amendment, the opinions of the Court in the *Everson* and *McCollum* cases are based on highly questionable premises and the decision in the *Everson* case is hardly in accord with sound constitutional doctrine. The appropriation of public funds to pay for the transportation of children to parochial schools, which have a clearly sectarian objective, can not be regarded as other than forbidden by the Constitution. In the *Everson* case Justice Black and four of his colleagues upheld such an appropriation on the ground that the school child, not the church, was receiving the benefit of a public welfare program designed to protect and assist children in going to and from public and parochial schools. The defect in the use of this public welfare argument is two-fold. In the first place, Justice Black concedes that the sectarian objective of the parochial school is aided by the payment of bus fare and that a direct appropriation to the parochial school would have been invalid. The conclusion is inescapable that an appropriation, which would be invalid under the First Amendment if made directly, is permitted if made indirectly and as a part of a general program characterized as promoting the public welfare. Secondly, the line of reasoning which justifies bus fares would also justify the appropriation of public funds for the construction, maintenance and staffing of parochial schools, particularly if the appropriation were in the form of payments to parents to reimburse them for tuition. Certainly the child is as much the direct beneficiary of heat, light, seats and instruction in the parochial school as he is the direct beneficiary of the bus fare.

In the *McCollum* opinion Justice Black carried to an extreme the principle that governmental funds and assistance should not be devoted to sectarian ends. He and a majority of his colleagues found that the "released time" system of religious education in Champaign, Illinois, was unconstitutional because "not only are the state's tax-supported public school buildings used for the dissemination of religious doctrines. The State also affords sectarian groups an invaluable aid in that it helps to provide pupils for their religious classes through use of the state's compulsory public school machinery."[67]

While this conclusion is apparently logical, it has rather weak support in terms of past American constitutional thought. For one thing, the compulsory attendance feature of the "released time" system which Justice Black emphasizes is an aid to religion quite similar in effect to the Everson township bus fare appropriation. Justice Black noted in both cases that the local government was helping to provide attendance for religious instruction;[68] but while the help was regarded as a constitutional defect in one case, it was not so regarded in the other. A reading of the two opinions provides a simple justification for this difference: the promotion of the public welfare in the form of conveying children safely to and from school justifies an incidential aid to religion, whereas the public welfare is not similarly promoted by the "released time" system of religious education. The distinction is and will remain acceptable until a group in a community urges that the promotion of the public welfare in the form of developing an appreciation of moral and ethical values in the younger generation also justifies an incidental aid to religion. This public welfare argument is consequently dangerous, for in every request for governmental assistance to churches it could probably be argued that the public welfare was being promoted, and the church-state relationship in the United States could thereby gradually be upset. It is unfortunate that Justice Black has indicated no awareness that such a development could stem from his opinions.

Another dubious position of Justice Black and his colleagues in the *McCollum* case lies in the implication in the above quotation that tax-supported public school buildings can under no circumstances be used for religious instruction.

---

[67] 333 U. S. 212.

[68] In the Everson opinion Justice Black observed: "It is undoubtedly true that children are helped to get to church schools. There is even a possibility that some of the children might not be sent to the church schools if the parents were compelled to pay their transportation." 330 U. S. 17.

Here the Court is applying a principle to a situation which its originators did not have in mind and did not intend to cover. To be sure, the original and continuing doctrine has been that no person shall be taxed to support a religious sect, whether it be his or someone else's; and Madison, in his famous *Memorial and Remonstrance*, indicated that this was to be the case even though the tax were only three pence. Viewed in its proper historical perspective, however, it is clear that this policy was specifically directed against the use of public funds to pay for maintenance of church buildings, missionary work, ministers' salaries and the like. There was no thought in 1800 of prohibiting the use of a microscopic portion of public funds for heating, lighting and maintaining school rooms for short weekly periods of religious instruction of the nature provided in Champaign, Illinois. Justice Black and the majority have stretched the principle of non-financial support beyond its intended scope. Even the tradition, developed since the middle of the last century, that no public funds shall be made available for sectarian instruction does not directly apply to the *McCollum* situation. The things which that tradition attacked were first, the public support of any educational system designed to promote the tenets of a particular sect, and, second, any religious ceremonies or instruction in the public schools with a sectarian flavor which would be offensive to some members of a class and would cause friction in the community. It should be remembered that the system to which the principle was opposed was one in which it was assumed that sectarianism would be imposed involuntarily upon a class. The Court would have been in a better position in applying this traditional principle to the "released time" system if it had shown that the Champaign arrangement involved basic defects of the earlier sectarianism in the schools, such as involuntary imposition of sectarianism, or preferential treatment of a sect, or discrimination against a sect.

In the existence of such defects the Court might have found better grounds upon which to reach its decision in the *McCollum* case. From a very practical point of view all possible denominations existing in Champaign, Illinois, could not be accommodated in the schools. Thus several controls were established whereby either the Council on Religious Education or the Superintendent of the schools could deny the facilities of the schools to a particular denomination: there had to be enough requests to make it practical to have a class in the sect involved; the instructor provided had to show evidence of a use of good English; and no material of a controversial nature was to be included in the instruction. There is, in these controls, a potentiality for discrimination; and if discrimination actually existed, as appellant's briefs suggested, then this would have been a sound ground upon which the Court could have reached its decision.[69] But the Court did not dwell upon this point, for the suit was brought not by a religious denomination claiming discrimination but by a nonconformist mother on behalf of a son who cherished his mother's beliefs, or disbeliefs, and as a result had to sit in the corridor during the weekly period of religious instruction. It is not without interest that several minority religious groups filed *amicus curiae* briefs in support of the appellant's argument.[70]

---

[69] *Brief for Appellant*, pp. 8 and 11; and *Appellant's Reply Brief*, p. 5.

If the Court is to avoid the justifiable criticism of judicial usurpation, it must confine its development of the "establishment" clause to those constitutional principles regarding church-state relations that have become well established. Specifically, the Court should at the first opportunity dispel two implications made in the *Everson* and *McCollum* opinions. It should make clear that the First Amendment does not prohibit all forms—however remote—of public assistance to religion but recognizes a distinction between permissible and non-permissible assistance to religion. The Court would also do well to reject the use of the public welfare argument as a justification for governmental action which, without such an argument to support it, would be regarded as violating the First Amendment.

In the area of church-state relations the public welfare argument amounts to the automatic validity of all legislation, and thus a denial of any constitutional prohibiton. All legislation in a democracy arises from the belief that it promotes the public welfare. But under a constitutional democracy that fact alone cannot logically be used, as it seems to have been used in the *Everson* opinion, to override the basic premise of constitutionalism that there are certain limits to governmental action which may not be exceeded by legislative action even though that action is taken in the sincere belief that the public welfare will thereby be promoted.

If the Court clarifies its position on these two points along the lines indicated, it can in the future be on sound ground in developing limits of permissible aid by confining itself to the prevention of sectarian preference, religious discrimination and oppression. By such self-limitations, the Court can in large measure avoid playing the role of a super-board of education[71] and can leave to the legislatures and the people the future development of those areas of church-state relations which are not clearly covered by the Constitution.

---

[70] *Amicus curiae* briefs were filed in support of appellant by The American Unitarian Association, the Synagogue Council of America and National Community Relations Advisory Council, the General Conference of Seventh Day Adventists, the American Ethical Union, and the American Civil Liberties Union.

[71] See E. S. Corwin, "The Supreme Court as National School Board," *Thought*, Vol. 23, pp. 665–683 (December, 1948).

NOTES AND MEMORANDA

THE IMMEDIATE FUTURE OF RESEARCH POLICY AND METHOD IN POLITICAL SCIENCE*

HAROLD D. LASSWELL
Yale University

The continuing crisis of national defense will intensify the pressure on available manpower and facilities. The claims of research in political science will be weighed against research opportunities in the other social sciences, the biological and physical sciences, and the humanities. It is timely, therefore, to consider what is to be done.

For purposes of the present discussion I am thinking of what can be accomplished by academically qualified students of political science. I have in mind the doctors of philosophy or others who have done advanced university work in something labelled "government" or "political science." This disposes of one source of ambiguity which arises in any discussion about "research in political science," since the writer may mean research conducted by academic political scientists or research done on a subject matter. By choosing the first definition, however, I have not escaped from the misunderstandings that may crop up from the existence among academicians of conflicting conceptions of the scope and method of political science.

The subject matter is often defined in what may be called a conventional sense as the study of government, or in functional terms as the study of power (defined as decision-making). Courses in college and university departments usually deal with government in the conventional meaning of the word, and describe international, national, state and local examples. In recent years some academicians have recommended that the scope of political science should embrace all "sanctioned choices," whether or not made by an agency which is locally called governmental. Scholars who favor the functional viewpoint are searching for criteria which will free them from any obligation to study the trivial because it is "governmental," or to refrain from inquiring into the important because it bears another name.

When we think of political science in functional terms, we see at once that some of the most valuable work has been done by other than academically trained political scientists. The academic economists who study monopoly, public finance, international trade and labor relations are, in many cases, studying the decision-making process. Academic sociologists are studying power when they analyze revolutions, or describe the connection between social structure and ideology. Academic anthropologists are studying power when they compare the decision-making forms and facts among "folk cultures." Individual and social psychologists deal with the power process when they devise tests which select those competent to take the lead in various situations.

---

* Although the statements made in this brief paper have benefited from discussion, they are not necessarily to be ascribed to the members of the Research Committee of the Association.

For purposes of this discussion it is unnecessary to develop the conventional and functional contrast any further. It should be noted, however, that divergent views among academic political scientists about the scope of the subject have consequences in terms of the research projects which they are prepared to initiate or to endorse. My view is that if academic political scientists do not conceive of the subject in a broadly functional sense, they will damage the profession. Already "political scientists" are rejected by some governmental and private agencies because "the political scientist is a man without a skill." If a vacancy exists in a public law post, the custom is to hire an academically trained lawyer in preference to a political scientist who has taken courses in law. Studies of "public opinion" gravitate into the domain of "social psychologists" and of other specialists who appear to possess a method. "Personnel" problems fall into the hands of specialists who also appear to have a method.

There is no convincing reason why the academic political scientist should abandon political science to others. Even on the lowest evaluation, academic political science cannot be written off entirely, as a total loss. It possesses a tradition capable of being re-vitalized, since neither Aristotle nor Plato nor Machiavelli, not to mention the Oriental theorists, confused the proper scope of the subject with what happened to be called "government" in the usage of some locality. Furthermore, the continuing crisis in world affairs is closing the gap that, in the "open societies," has developed between "government" and the making of key decisions for the community.

What purposes are to be served by political science research? Research planning and execution need to be viewed in the context of policy thinking. In the clarification of policy, the significant questions appear to be these: What goal values are sought? What are the trends in the degree to which goals are realized? What factors condition these trends? What are the policy alternatives, and what is their probable contribution to the attainment of goal values in the future?

We do not turn to research in order to discover our fundamental values, such as preference for "human dignity" of man. However, research-mindedness is essential if we are to reduce the ambiguity of our ultimate aspirations by translating them into concrete practices. And research is essential if we are to be supplied with reliable and inclusive accounts of the trends and conditions that affect policy.

I. SURVEYS OF TREND

The most hopeful large-scale enterprise appears to be the development of procedures by which significant political trends can be reported and analyzed. Such information is essential to the professional quality of the contribution to be made by political scientists. It is essential to know how the situation as a whole is changing in reference to the basic goals of policy. I postulate that the goals of fundamental policy in this country (ideally conceived) can be expressed in terms of human dignity. Under the crisis conditions now prevailing and in prospect, it is of the utmost importance for political scientists to take timely and continuous action in their behalf. Our problem is to combine national security with individual freedom, in order to bring about the largest net result in terms of human values.

One of the affirmative opportunities of the crisis is to build a more perfect union of free peoples. We need to keep informed of the trends moving toward and away from union on this scale, and to guide our participation in decision-making with these trends in mind.

I assume it to be obvious that our strong preference for democratic values need not, and ought not, interfere with the objectivity with which we apply ourselves to the task of describing and analyzing facts. The proper place for "non-objectivity" is in our declaration of fundamental preferences.

Trend-reporting procedures are now too meagre and uncorrelated to provide political scientists with needed bases of inference. Since we are preoccupied chiefly with security, liberty and union, we require an intelligence process capable of producing the facts upon the basis of which dependable estimates of the changing dispersion of power, and of the chief factors which affect these shifts, can be made. Since as American political scientists our most immediate responsibility is at home, some indices are of obvious relevance to the total project.

Consider, for example, the question of *popular votes*. Despite the admitted importance of voting, there is no great center of voting studies in the United States. Hence it is impossible to find a commanding repository of information about the formal and effective voting practices prevailing at all levels of government.

Another body of information whose significance is universally acknowledged is provided by *opinion polls*. Professor Hadley Cantril and his associates have tried to assemble all polling results. However, as the volume of polling rises in all parts of the country (and abroad), there is a growing need for ever more elaborate facilities than now exist.

Party platforms and *pressure group resolutions* must be taken into account in any thorough analysis or interpretation of the politics of a free people. For many years Professor Kirk Porter kept everyone in his debt by compiling the national platforms. But platforms are also made at state and city levels. Local material yields its meaning only when the whole vast picture is sufficiently well-known to highlight the potential importance of minor variations. Although every textbook on party government and public opinion utilizes to some degree the resolutions of pressure groups, no one has made himself responsible for publishing comprehensive compilations of pressure group actions taken at annual or biennial conventions, to say nothing of the more frequent commitments made by boards of directors.

Every specialist can go beyond this minimum list of needed trend information. Undoubtedly some will want to gather the *votes of official bodies* at every level (presumably with a sampling procedure for local units). Some will want to study informal opinion as revealed in *editorials or news treatment* in such mass media of communication as radio-TV, print, and film. Others will want detailed and comparable reports of the flow of *debate in official bodies.* Other scholars will stress the importance of information about the *control setup* of such organizations as pressure groups, whose membership, finances and internal discipline are not now regularly reported. (Trends in effective control can often be indicated by examining the "circulation of the elite" within each organization.)

Scholars are only too well aware that no single index is likely to provide definitive indications of complex and important changes. Indices must be interpreted in the light of the richest possible historical and analytic conception of the entire context. The types of information mentioned above will be welcome, but they will not transform the scholar into an automatic computer. On the contrary, more detailed knowledge enables him to reach for new and subtler understanding.

As a reminder of the richness of the task of studying trends in shared or concentrated power, consider the following partial definitions of political democracy, and reflect upon the most useful operational indices thereof:

> Power is shared when the political myth favors the pattern of general participation in the making of decisions.
>
> Power is shared when in fact there is general participation in decision-making.
>
> Shared power means that it is assumed that office-holders can be criticized without fear of serious retaliation.
>
> Shared power means that the shaping of decisions depends upon values to which access can be had on the basis of merit.
>
> Shared power includes the freedom to challenge the lawfulness of applying general rules to concrete cases.
>
> Power is shared when there is an effective presumption against the politicizing of human relations.

The aim of perfecting the trend survey is to provide an orderly report upon some of the recognized bases of inference about significant political transformations.

II. TRENDS AND CONDITIONING FACTORS

The setting up of procedures by which significant trends are regularly described can yield more than mere facts about the rise and fall of sundry aspects of freedom. Trends do not live in isolation. Often they modify one another. When studies of trend are well thought-out in advance and made subject to appropriate methods of correlation analysis, the scientific core of political science can be greatly strengthened.

The fact is that trend research makes it possible to arrange for the continuous application of *all* fundamental propositions about political conduct to the understanding of the current transformation through which any community, local or global, is moving. In this way the gap can be closed between the "high level abstractions" of descriptive political theory and the scientific and policy interests of a given time and place. The first technical step in conducting research on trend is to take the "key abstractions," such as "freedom" or "shared power," and to choose the most appropriate indices for each term.

By giving to these words a "local habitation," and by viewing all problems in relation to a comprehensive framework of political inquiry, the fundamental laws of political science can be kept in continual relationship to contemporary history and policy. Much of the disappointment occasionally expressed regarding the lack of fruitful interplay between theory, research and policy can be overcome by grasping the opportunities for research on trend. If we connect the basic propositions of systematic political science with concrete current situations, the traditional corpus of political science can be rescued from the relative oblivion of the textbooks on the history of political theory.

Let us briefly consider one example connected with voting. Assume that our studies of trend show that non-voting is increasing more rapidly among young men than among young women of the same age. We not only want to report the difference, but to report other trend information which possesses some explanatory significance. How do we go about it? If we possess a comprehensive framework for inquiry, we do not proceed to think at random. We attack the problem in purposeful fashion. Assume that we adopt the maximizing postulate in reference to all conduct, according to which one "political act" is preferred above another act by an "actor" when the former is expected to be more advantageous than the latter. We can now ask ourselves to think of hypotheses capable of accounting for the different expectations about the respective advantages of voting which are entertained by young men and young women. On the basis of such hypotheses we may be led to the gathering of additional information about trend. Perhaps we consider the possibility that voting seems to be much more difficult to young men than to young women during a given period, because the young men move around more and encounter more difficulties connected with registration and balloting. Not only may the difficulties be of a technical nature, such as the practices that govern registration or absentee balloting, but the expectations of mobility on the part of the young men may reduce the advantages which they may anticipate from participating in elections. Obviously the hypotheses thus far referred to can be studied by several procedures now available to political scientists. However, some of the data pertaining to these hypotheses can be gathered by concentrating upon a few items, such as information about the differential place and job mobility of young men and women. The point is that, if we look at any context of which voting is a component, our fundamental postulate concerning political choice is likely to lead to the consideration of features which explain certain trends on the basis of comparatively concise indicators.

III. TRENDS AND TOOLS

The study of trend has another important contribution to make to the scientific understanding of politics. It is possible for trend research to include the testing of the procedures by which data are obtained. Old procedures must be re-adapted to new purposes in all developing fields of knowledge. The *administrative diary* is an excellent example of how an old tool can be adapted to political research. The procedure is for the administrator or his advisor to make notes close to an event of policy making or execution. The turning of the diary to the task of "capturing and recording" the processes of policy is a development of no small consequence. A closely related procedure for the gathering of data is the making of observations by a *participant observer who is not responsible for policy.* (This method was employed by Herman Finer during the early years of TVA.) Yet another closely related procedure is the *eliciting of comment from participants upon summaries of what transpired.* Much of the material assembled by the Committee on Public Administration Cases was processed in this way.

It is important to remember that research tools are themselves part of the changing social context. At any given time social investigators are accustomed to "calibrate" the results obtainable by one procedure with the results of other procedures. The study of public opinion by polling interviews, for instance, has advanced in scientific stature as the characteristic result yielded by each type of interview has become known. Since the rôle of every research tool may vary from time to time, it is essential to provide for "re-calibration" studies. As old animosities toward a new method are overcome, for example, it may be that less allowance must be made for conscious deception on the part of unwilling subjects.

The salient point for political research is that the organized surveying of trend can keep in usable condition the entire arsenal of procedures appropriate to political science.

IV. TRENDS AND UNOFFICIAL PRE-TESTS

Furthermore, the continuing survey of trend can be so conducted that pre-testing devices can simultaneously contribute to science and to policy. In a crude sense, pre-testing has been used by practical politicians ever since anyone rehearsed a speech in private before a potential member of the audience. Today such methods have been regularized and disciplined to serve many purposes. The effectiveness of a poster can be pre-tested in different parts of the country before it is released. Sometimes the final product is suppressed or remodelled in the light of the tests.

Although we usually think of pre-testing as a tool of policy, it is also an important instrument of science. The results of pre-tests add to our knowledge of audience predisposition. This is very important when the trend data obtained during a given period does not include direct samples of the environmental conditions to which the audience is likely to be exposed in the immediate future. For example, elections may have been suppressed for years, and the composition of the population may have changed greatly in the meanwhile. Limited, unofficial pre-tests may show that all persons over fifty have definite ideas about whether and how they should vote, and how an election should be conducted. Persons below fifty may have no well-formulated ideas on the subject. Pre-tests can be used to uncover the best combination of incentives by which interest in voting and in general discussion can be stimulated. The information obtained by intensive interviews or by the study of electoral history during the pre-dictatorship period may be scientifically evaluated in reference to pre-testing results. If interviewing or historical procedures were "perfect," they would enable one to predict the outcome of the pre-tests. In practice, it is likely that the pre-test can be treated as a scientific tool capable of adding characteristic items to the picture of audience predisposition.

V. TRENDS AND OFFICIAL PRE-TESTS

In popular usage it is common to speak of a limited official introduction of a new practice as an "experiment," as when it is said that the States have experimented with new institutions of government. Strictly, the term experiment is too useful to be applied in this way. We need a word with the scientific connotation of "controlled manipulation," as when we modify a single factor, and hold everything else constant. When an official pre-test is made, the publicity given to the enterprise, coupled with the overt effects that it has upon the body politic, may so modify the total situation that "other things cannot be held constant."

However, the inadequacy of official pre-tests should not be exaggerated. In a nation-wide administrative hierarchy, small innovations can be introduced in isolated spots, while matched situations are left alone. The "test" group can thus be compared with the "control" group from time to time.

As official pre-tests alter the total picture, the task of discovering the distinctive results of a test becomes progressively difficult. We can be rather confident of the analysis of the results of tests made upon narrowly circumscribed changes lying beyond the focus of national-attention (such as the effect of "rest periods" during the day upon "output"). But it is possible to accept estimates of the effect of TVA upon the Tennessee Valley with less assurance, especially when the results are examined from the point of view of a general theory of such installations upon "valleys."

VI. ENLARGING THE SCOPE OF FREEDOM

Well-organized research on trend can be especially effective as a means of enlarging the range of choice open to all who participate in the making and execution of policy. By the use of pre-testing procedures the scope of policy alternatives can be greatly extended, and increasing insight can be obtained into the predispositions of all concerned.

Now it is true that pre-testing enables the leadership to make predictions about how a large audience will respond, since the nature of a pre-test is to expose a small and representative sample of a potential audience to deliberate changes.

The prominence of prediction as a product of scientific work is so great that the principal contribution of science to policy is often thought to lie in the improvement of forecasts. However, the main advantage of studying society is not that such a study contributes to prediction, but to freedom. The impact of scientific research upon human relations is particularly important when it has reduced the accuracy of prediction by enlarging the scope of freedom.

Assume, for instance, that an analysis of the trend of decisions made by the disciplinary boards of a public authority reveals that the majority usually agree, when the rights of women are an issue, in discriminating against women. Pre-tests may show that new rules for the benefit of women are not enforced. When this is made known to the officials involved, some re-thinking may take place. Perhaps, the judges were unaware of their bias. Perhaps the decisions of the board now become less predictable than before in cases involving women, since the automatic, compulsive, unreflecting factors that contributed to uniformity of response are no longer effective. We contribute to freedom of choice when we bring to the focus of wakening attention that which has been unnoticed before, and which has therefore gone without challenge or evaluation. When we draw the hitherto unobserved into conscious awareness, we permit rational processes to assert themselves, with the result that the former response is subject to deliberate revision.

Properly understood, the laws of political science summarize relations which have held true in the past, and they bear an implicit warning concerning their application to the future—*subject to change with insight.* The greatest opportunity of political science is to provide procedures by which all facets of policy are subjected to the discipline of insight.

VII. WHAT THE AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION CAN DO

With the establishment of a national office the APSA has an agency which may be utilized for the purpose of improving the research contributions made by the membership. Perhaps it is not too much to hope that the office will be given the staff enabling it to become a great clearing house for the hundreds of colleges and universities now engaged in the teaching of political science. Many political science teachers are sufficiently well trained to supervise the gathering of trend data, and many students are enough interested and gifted to take part in a program of field work.

Consider the study of voting trends. Through the Association office, or a committee of the Association, or the directors of a "ballot center" (or through a combination of all three), teachers of political science throughout the nation may be invited to cooperate in surveys of voting. Sometimes this activity will be limited to collecting the results of votes, and the regulations of voting, which are otherwise unobtainable. But local studies can go further. An appropriate committee of the Association, for instance could take the responsibility for posing problems that would contribute to knowledge, and for keeping alive reporting and interpreting activities that would include all cooperating scholars.

VIII. SUPPLYING THE PROFESSION WITH INTELLIGENCE SERVICES

We know that political science teachers are on call in their localities for comment on public issues. There is no doubt that one of the important contributions of the scholar to public life is in clarifying the goals of democratic polity, and in analyzing alternatives of policy in the light of available knowledge of trends and conditioning factors. It cannot be said, however, that political scientists are as well equipped as they ought to be to perform this great service of public enlightenment. Often the professor has little more information at his disposal than the lay citizen, although special training may enable him to make more useful interpretations of the news.

During the present national crisis it is especially important that political scientists take the enlightenment function with enough seriousness to improve the intelligence sources upon which their interpretations are based. Therefore the Association would do well to enlarge the scope of the services which it performs for its members by providing a flow of well-analyzed intelligence. This needs to go beyond the REVIEW to the circulation of special bulletins, basic data slips, and documents. The service might develop to the point of providing charts and slides for immediate use in and outside the classroom and adult education circle.

For some years the unsatisfactory state of the yearbooks now available has been deplored. Quincy Wright, among others, has recommended that steps be taken nationally, or on an international scale, to gather more basic information about political and social trends. Such an enterprise is part of the task of providing political scientists with the intelligence services which they need in order to improve the quality of their advice on public questions, and to give an outlet and an incentive to research.

In passing, it may be remarked that as soon as the flow of trend material reaches greater volume and comprehensiveness, effective use may be made of the new computing machines which have been invented in recent years, and which were described by a representative of the U. S. Bureau of Standards at the 1950 meeting of the Association in Washington.[1] In view of the complexity and richness of the context which is essential for political judgment, and for the advancement of political science, the new gadgets hold out hopeful prospects for the closer articulation of knowledge and action. "The abundance problem," which was also described at the same Association meeting (by Harold Stein), may become less pressing on some matters when more interrelationships can be found by the computers.

IX. TEAM RESEARCH

Problems connected with interdisciplinary research will be much simplified as political scientists are better provided with basic information. There is a vast and productive meeting ground which can be used by all scholars who seek to comprehend the interdependence of trends, and to make likely projections of current developments into the future. Economists have brought together, or stimulated the gathering of, time series summarizing the movement of prices and goods. However, many of the interpretations offered by economists for the guidance of public policy can be improved when political scientists outline their part of the common picture with greater authority and precision, and succeed in rejuvenating political theory. Side by side with the theoretical models of a

---

[1] See also Mina Rees, "The Federal Computing Machine Program," *Science*, Vol. 112, pp. 731–6 (December 22, 1950).

"competitive economy," or a "monopolistically competitive economy," we need to perfect our conception of a "democratic polity" and of the "polities of dictatorship," as related to diverse cultural contexts. Not only cooperation among social scientists but with physical scientists will be expedited by the growth of knowledge about trend.[2]

X. TEAMWORK AT POLICY CONFERENCES

Another gain to the profession, and ultimately to the country, from an enlarged program of trend research will be to enhance the nature of the contribution that can be made by political scientists in the formation of policy at every level.

A standing complaint among those charged with responsibility for the making of important choices inside or outside the government is lack of time. Everyone is threatened by the guillotines that fall when deadlines are not met. "Long-range" thinking goes by default. Hence one of the opportunities open to the scholar is to provide comprehensive and long-range thinking, and to make it available for planning, enacting and operating decisions.

The professional political scientist can better equip himself to perform a policy-clarifying task when his trend information is both inclusive and selective. During the continuing crisis of national security, it is important to keep alive the initiative of the nation as a whole. Opinion leaders at every level need to meet for the sake of assessing the national effort. In these gatherings the role of the political scientist can be particularly helpful in providing a frame of reference in which all items of information and all interpretations of policy can find a place.

XI. ACTION CAN BE TAKEN NOW

There is evidence that the political scientists of the nation are prepared to take new initiatives at the present time in research policy and in the advancement of research method. The work of committees of the Association has won deserved commendation, and the Washington office is a promising step. A reviving concern with questions of theory and method is a most encouraging new current. On the pedagogical front new courses in political behavior are attempting to draw upon the results and the procedures of every discipline capable of deepening our knowledge of political behavior. The close connection between government and the members of the Association has produced a corps of scholars seasoned by responsibility. The challenge of new fields of intensified study, such as public administration and international relations, has made it essential to re-think the central frame of reference of political science. And the deepening crisis of our period provides cumulative incentives for the man of knowledge to devise a strategy of research which bears directly upon the problems of security, liberty and union that weigh upon us all.

---

[2] At the round table of the 1950 APSA meeting under the chairmanship of William Ebenstein, several reports were made on the problems of cooperative research. Leo C. Rosten gave a particularly insightful account of the physical scientist as a partner.

RESPONSIBLE PARTIES: A DISSENT FROM THE FLOOR

JULIUS TURNER
Allegheny College

The report of the Committee on Political Parties of the American Political Science Association[1] presents the case for the development of disciplined and responsible parties in a document more complete and more dramatic than any previous summarization of the case. While the report may not secure the attention of "everyone interested in politics," as the authors hope, it nevertheless will reach most teachers of political parties courses. Rinehart and Company, who have charge of distribution, may look forward to a brisk sale for classroom use.

Because of the influence which the report will have on students of the party system, it is unfortunate that there was no minority report to indicate disagreement or doubt within the Committee. Readers may conclude that the recommendations should be accepted with the same trust as the recommendations of a group of physicians who have agreed on the diagnosis of a disease. The Committee's reference to "the results of scientific analysis that have come from the research activity of a great number of specialists"[2] suggests that such an analogy was considered.

The minority report must come from the floor and not from the Committee. This "dissent from the floor" recognizes the hard work which the Committee has done in compiling and analyzing much of the available knowledge of political scientists on the problem of party responsibility. The report is, as the Committee states, a "starting point for constructive public debate, . . . and more intensive scientific studies."[3]

But the report can be no more than a starting point, for its value is limited by errors in two broad aspects, as follows:

I. The Committee has underestimated present party responsibility.

II. Some reforms which the Committee proposes will accentuate present defects in our party system.

For these reasons, the report should be given the widest possible circulation among students of political science, but its conclusions should be treated with caution.

I. THE COMMITTEE HAS UNDERESTIMATED PRESENT PARTY RESPONBISILITY

There are two questions involved in criticism of the present responsibility of parties: 1. Do the parties present clear alternatives to the voters, so that there is reality in the choice on election day? 2. Once the voters have made a choice between alternatives, are policies which received the support of the majority carried into effect?

---

[1] "Toward a More Responsible Two-Party System," AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE REVIEW, Vol. 44 (September, 1950, Supplement). Hereafter citations to the report will be indicated by page number only.

[2] P. v.

[3] P. ix. The words omitted are "creative political action." It would be unwise to take political action based on the Committee's report until after more debate and much more intensive scientific study.

1. *Do the parties present clear alternatives to the voters?* The Committee believes that the answer is "No." In discussing platforms, the report maintains that "alternatives between the parties are defined so badly that it is often difficult to determine what the election has decided even in broadest terms."[4] In what appears to be a comment on Congress, the report states that "the sort of opposition presented by a coalition that cuts across party lines, *as a regular thing*, tends to deprive the public of a meaningful alternative. . . . Moreover, on that basis it is next to impossible to hold either party responsible for its political record."[5]

Contrary to the Committee's conclusions, platforms do reveal party differences on national issues affecting many groups. Analysis of the platforms of 1948, for example, reveals collisions in ideology and differences in emphasis which could hardly escape a serious reader. Democrats advocated repeal of the Taft-Hartley act; Republicans commended themselves for having passed it. Republicans advocated "prudent conservation of resources" in foreign aid programs; Democrats boasted that "generous sums have been provided." Republicans promised another reduction in taxes, especially to provide an incentive to new industry; Democrats advocated a reduction, when possible, for low-income groups only. Republicans advocated either voluntary cooperation, or state and local control of public policies; Democrats pointed to a long list of federal legislation enacted by their party.

On many other points, to be sure, the promises, claims, or criticisms of one party were not met squarely by the other. For example, Democratic criticism of tariff, immigration, anti-inflation, housing and "thought control" legislative action in the Republican 80th Congress was met by Republican emphasis on the more popular aspects of the same legislation. Republican criticism of "the tragic lack of foresight and general inadequacy of the Executive" was countered by specific Democratic reference to acts and recommendations of the President deemed valuable in the campaign, such as the Truman doctrine, the recognition of Israel, and the President's civil rights program.

Greater differences in party platforms than those mentioned above would impose a burden which politicians in a republican system could not be expected to bear. If the platforms were to point out clearly all differences between parties, then each party would be forced to reveal not only its assets but also its liabilities. In such a utopian situation, Democrats might be expected to admit that expanded welfare programs require increased taxation or debt, and Republicans would frankly state that an increase in the proportion of Protestant immigrants to the United States necessarily cuts down the proportion of Catholics and Jews admitted. Such political naivete is not characteristic even in countries with highly disciplined parties, and would not be countenanced by American politicians, however reformed.

---

[4] P. 30.

[5] P. 19 (italics supplied). See also p. v. It is regrettable that the committee did not look to the President, and presidential candidates, for examples of the presentation of alternative policies. There is a tendency among political scientists to minimize such differences as existed, say, between Smith and Hoover, Roosevelt and Landon, or Truman and Dewey. The realignment of interest group support for the parties since 1928 is an indication that such groups perceived important differences. For the influence of President Franklin Roosevelt on both labor and business support see Hugh A. Bone, *American Politics and the Party System* (New York, 1949), pp. 319–326.

The shortcomings of present platforms lie, in other words, not in their failure to present reasonable alternatives, but in a popular belief that platforms have little meaning for the voter. Public belief that platforms rarely reveal party differences probably springs from public ignorance of each platform's contents. Responsibility for this ignorance perhaps may be laid at the feet of uninspired journalists[6] who fail to reduce platform verbiage to terms which readers can understand. Political science, however, can make up in part for the deficiencies of journalists. If the Committee on Parties had included among the scientific studies on which its report is based a point-by-point comparison of the platforms, it might have reversed its conclusions and added to public understanding of party differences.

The Committee has erred to a greater extent in its discussion of Congress than in its analysis of platforms. Contrary to popular impression, the parties usually maintain their ranks on congressional votes, including those of headline significance, with sufficient solidarity so that voters may distinguish between two points of view. In eight modern sessions, for example, party behavior could be scientifically distinguished on 407 of the 455 roll calls recorded in the House of Representatives.[7] Nor were the roll calls on which the parties disagreed confined to issues of minor importance. The accompanying table lists some of the issues on which the parties differed. The list is by no means complete, for it has been culled to avoid repetition or lengthy explanation (for example, votes on public power have separated the parties in almost all sessions examined, but only two such votes are included in the table). This abbreviated list of party issues covers a wide variety of subjects, including the tariff,[8] monopoly, control of business, foreign relations, taxes of several kinds, civil rights, national defense, farm policy, relief, housing, administrative reorganization, the size and power of the executive branch and state's rights.

---

[6] Perhaps the journalists are not entirely uninspired. Democrats might argue that the Republican press finds it to its advantage to minimize differences in party ideology. By reinforcing the belief of low-income Republicans that little partisan difference exists, the party may be able to retain their allegiance. The assumption of this strategy would be that high-income Republicans are less gullible than their poorer brothers. For statistics supporting these conclusions, see Gerhart H. Saenger, "Social Status and Political Behavior," *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 51, pp. 109–110 (September, 1945).

[7] The sessions, with percentages of roll calls on which the parties differed significantly, are as follows: 1921, 85.7; 1928, 88.1; 1930–1, 82.8; 1933, 90.0; 1937, 87.1; 1944, 85.7; 1945, 95.0; 1948, 95.5. Average for all roll calls, 89.5. Roll call behavior was measured by the chi-square test, with 1/100 as the level of significance.

[8] For a study of party votes on reciprocal trade legislation since 1934, see Richard Strout, "The Elephant, the Donkey and the Tariff," *Christian Science Monitor*, September 17, 1949 (Magazine Section), p. 5. Mr. Strout discovered extreme party differences in all sessions in which the legislation was considered.

It may be argued that, while the parties differ on some important issues, the compelling issues of the year do not separate the parties for the convenience of the voter. Such a condition may have existed in 1928 when, on three roll calls on the McNary-Haugen Bill, the parties' proportions of "yea" votes were almost identical, and perhaps in 1944, when Lend-Lease failed to arouse partisanship. In all other sessions studied, however, the issues on which the parties failed to differ were matters of routine.[9]

On a national scale, there is little reason for the voter to be unable to distinguish between the parties in Congress. In states and congressional districts, however, the voter may have more difficulty. The national parties as a whole show significant lines of disagreement, but some individual congressmen confuse the voters by support for the policies of the other party. The problem, however, does not affect many districts. Of 4,658 members of the House in eleven selected modern sessions, only 181, or less than four per cent (about sixteen congressmen each year), voted with the opposing party more often than with their own. The proportion was slightly higher in the Senate, where smaller numbers promote independence. Of the 847 Senators in nine sessions, 63, or 7.4 per cent (seven Senators a year), bolted their parties on a majority of the votes.[10]

Voters in some specific districts, such as those of Representative Javitz in New York and Senator McCarran in Nevada, may be confused by the incumbent's behavior. In most northern states, however, the insurgent has been forced into that position by the views of his constituents,[11] and faces in the election an opponent who is even more critical of the bolter's party than the bolter himself. Republican liberals such as Javitz or Tobey must oppose

---

[9] On some important bills the parties have failed to differ on one roll call, but have disagreed sharply on another—for example, farm relief in 1933, neutrality legislation in 1937, rent control in 1948. The roll calls on which there was no significant difference between the parties may be categorized as follows: farm legislation, 9; civil service pay and regulations, 6; defense, 5; claims, suits and government contracts, 5; immigrants and aliens, 4; House rules and procedure, 4; rent control, 2; veterans, 2; prohibition, 2; District of Columbia, 2; monopoly, 2; foreign affairs, 2; women pilots, 1; sale of convict goods, 1; Indian administration, 1.

[10] The percentage of major party members who voted with the opposition more often than with their own party by years was as follows: House—1921, 0.7; 1928, 2.8; 1930–1, 5.0; 1933, 1.6; 1937, 1.9; 1944, 4.0; 1946, 14.3; 1947, 0.7; 1948, 0.2; 1949, 5.9; 1950, 5.3. Senate—1921, 4.2; 1930–1, 14.7; 1937, 15.2; 1944, 10.5; 1946, 6.4; 1947, 6.4; 1948, 1.1; 1949, 6.3; 1950, 2.1. Computations are based on members who voted on one-third or more of the issues on which party majorities were opposed in Congress. Figures for sessions from 1946–1950 adapted from the *Congressional Quarterly* and *CQ Almanac.*

[11] That insurgency is usually the result of constituent pressure, and not the vagaries of the congressman, is demonstrated by the marked tendency for insurgents to represent similar districts. Thus most modern Democratic insurgents come from the rural South; most Republican insurgents in the 1920's represented contiguous rural areas in the central states.

SELECTED EXAMPLES OF ROLL CALLS ON WHICH PARTIES DIFFERED SIGNIFICANTLY, EIGHT MODERN SESSIONS, HOUSE

Page Number[a] in *Congressional Record*	Description of Issue	Roll Call Vote Democrat		Roll Call Vote Republican	
		Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay
	1921				
1636	Emergency farm tariff, conference report	14	113	253	5
1994	Telephone anti-trust exemption, recommit	82	9	17	187
2546	German peace, rec., reserve U.S. right disarmament	117	1	0	259
3042	Farm loan fund appropriation, amend, reduce	2	104	218	0
	1928				
714	Revenue, amendment, graduated corporation tax	193	1	31	192
2339	Legalize interlocking bank directorates, recommit	123	32	17	160
2851	Army approp., amend to forbid foreign war	113	45	13	188
5604	Howard U. (Negro) approp. authorization, final	60	110	175	0
	1930–1				
5547	Liberty Bond, rec., remove tax exemption	144	5	34	214
4865	Navy approp., rec., reduce Nicaragua Marines	136	9	18	202
3659	Farm relief, amend, authorize Pres.' distribution	145	6	22	225
	1933				
2341	Create Tennessee Valley Authority, final	302	2	18	95
2815	Pres.' power to alter dollar, conf. report	299	8	30	85
4372	NIRA, recommit, add sales tax	62	232	77	32
3286	Ind. Offices approp. (veterans' cut), recommit	15	267	110	1
	1937				
1064	Reciprocal trade extension, final	284	11	3	86
8875	Administrative reorganization, final	262	29	19	52
5232	Relief approp., rec., transfer to state admin.	8	288	82	6
3352	Natl. Housing Act, rec., forbid rates over 7%	34	221	67	5
9662	Deficiencies, conf., amend, add cotton subsidy	217	58	3	80
	1944				
1228	Soldier vote, rec., substitute federal control	157	51	19	184
694	UNRRA appropriation, recommit, cut	18	178	113	83
1851	OPA extension (ending subsidies), conf. report	80	109	179	19
2479	Deficiencies, amend, cut Natl. Housing Admin.	6	129	120	25
6322	Rivers and Harbors approp., conf. report	177	0	44	147
	1945				
12094	Full employment, recommit	16	198	120	43
2856	Manpower draft, conference report	139	48	27	112
4164	Farm deferment, veto	30	164	155	12
6626	OPA extension, amendment, court review	47	154	153	8
14	Rules, permanent Un-Am. Activities Committee	70	150	138	34
9453	Administrative reorganization, recommit	7	189	160	2
5832	War agencies approp., rec., cut OWI	17	127	120	0
	1948				
2981	Rent control, amend, local board control	39	123	189	30
925	Revenue, rec., increase personal exemption	158	22	0	236
8473	Fed. Sec. Admin. approp., veto (separate agency)	59	111	229	1
8186	Agr. approp., amend, cut soil conservation	2	155	189	23
8473	Deficiencies, rec., raise rural electrification	169	3	28	201

[a] Totals for 1921, 1928, 1930–1, 1933, 1937 and 1944 compiled from *Congressional Record*, including pairs and announcements. Totals for 1945 and 1948 from *Congressional Quarterly*. The *Congressional Quarterly's* totals do not include pairs. If pairs were included, they would slightly accentuate party differences, since pairs tend to follow party lines.

Fair Deal Democrats; conservative Democrats such as Gillette and McCarran must face even more conservative Republicans. With only occasional exceptions,[12] northern voters have a clear choice, not only between national parties as a whole, but also between individual local candidates in states and congressional districts.

In the South, where most modern insurgency occurs,[13] the problem of voting alternatives is another matter. In most southern districts the parties never present a practical alternative in the general election, since Republican candidates have no chance of election. While the behavior of Southerners rarely corrupts Democratic discipline to the extent that the national parties cannot be distinguished, there is an obvious need for party reform in the South and in all one-party areas. This reform will be discussed in a later section.

2. *Is the program which received the support of a majority of voters put into effect?* If it is assumed that a majority of the voters favored the Democratic platform and President Truman's campaign speeches in 1948, then obviously the program desired by the majority has not been carried out in full. Since 1948 we have seen the Democrats fail to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act and to enact federal aid to education and civil rights legislation. On the other hand, the Democrats succeeded in carrying out a large part of their program, including extension of the Marshall plan, European armament legislation, changes in the reciprocal trade agreements act, expansion and increases in social security, an increase in the minimum wage, the middle income housing bill, and aid to farmers through crop insurance, rural electrification, irrigation and reclamation.

There is some reason for doubt, however, as to whether all parts of the Truman program actually received the support of a majority of voters. It would be a fortunate coincidence if the Democratic platform should happen to include no proposals opposed by a majority. Such a coincidence is made more unlikely by the fact that the planners of platforms and presidential campaigns do not direct their appeal to all voters on an equal basis. The peculiarities of our Electoral College force presidential candidates to place great weight on votes received in large, marginal states, whose voters may not necessarily agree with the rest of the country. Members of Congress may, therefore, furnish a better index of public opinion than the President, although congressmen, too, are unrepresentative to the extent that districts are gerrymandered and voters are uninformed.

In short, the program supported by the majority is not put into effect in entirety, if it is assumed that the national platform and the speeches of the victorious presidential candidate represent that program. Confusion is created, however, by the fact that the President, his party in Congress, and the National Convention all represent different electorates. A remedy for this confusion is discussed below.

A review of the responsibility of parties at present indicates that the need for reform is not great. Most voters, if they had the information, could distinguish between alternatives offered by parties and candidates. Most of the majority program is carried into effect. Moderate reforms can be utilized to make up for such defects as exist. It remains to be seen whether the Committee reforms would be "moderate," and whether these reforms would have any harmful effect.

---

[12] Senator Wayne Morse, who defeated a conservative Democrat in Oregon, was the only exception in 1950.

[13] Of 23 House insurgents in 1950, 17 were southern Democrats.

II. THE REFORMS WHICH THE COMMITTEE SEEKS WILL ACCENTUATE PRESENT DEFECTS IN THE PARTY SYSTEM

The proposal of political reform almost necessarily involves change in dynamic, rather than static, situations. Much as he may desire change, the political scientist cannot invent new methods or ideas to meet specific problems without anticipating the by-products of his reforms. Experience tells us that the by-products of reform are sometimes less tolerable than the evil which the reform was designed to correct. Senator Hubert Humphrey illustrated such a by-product at the APSA meeting in December, 1950, when, in discussing the limits of party responsibility in non-partisan Minnesota, he pointed to his audience as the originators of the non-partisan movement.

The existence of a dynamic situation should not prevent political scientists from proposing reform; it should, however, dictate careful scrutiny of the forces which the reform will set in motion. Undesirable results would follow from the implementation of the report of the Committee on Political Parties, for the Committee would give weapons to the dominant groups in each party by means of which 1) the number of one-party areas in the United States would be increased, and 2) the self-destructive tendencies of the minority party would be accentuated.

What are the weapons which the Committee would give to the dominant groups in each party? The report properly stresses democratic, voluntary and cooperative methods for attaining intra-party agreement. But, in addition, the Committee supports (usually as a last resort) techniques which would allow dominant groups to make over each party in their own image. Among other recommendations the Committee proposes that the parties be permitted to define their membership (p. 21); that the parties deal with rebellious state delegations by excluding them from National Conventions (pp. 23 and 48) and from National Committee posts (pp. 23, 39, and 48), by using national party funds to defeat local officers (p. 48), and by appointment of temporary state officers (p. 48); that the parties deal with insurgent Congressmen by withholding committee assignments (p. 23), committee chairmanships (p. 62) and federal patronage (p. 61); that a Party Council be given authority to recommend congressional candidates, screen presidential candidates, and interpret the platform (p. 43); and that the platform, when interpreted, be binding on all candidates, including state and local ones (pp. 53 and 56).

The first important effect of the use of these weapons by party leaders would be the spread of one-party monopoly in the United States. Statesmen and political scientists are accustomed to praise the two-party system, on the assumption that competition between two established groups, each with a reasonable chance of gaining office, increases governmental responsibility to the governed.[14] However, such close competition between established groups exists in the United States only at the national level, where the parties are balanced fairly equally for the election of the President, and in a minority of the constituencies which select the lesser officers of federal, state and local governments. Thus of 435 congressmen in the 81st Congress more than one-third sat secure in the knowledge that only an unprecedented political upheaval would remove them from office, and less than half of this number could expect defeat even if reaction against their party should provoke a landslide comparable to that of 1936.[15] The problem is not confined to the South. In the 81st Congress 141 northern congressmen had received more than 60 per cent of the vote in the preceding election, and stood no reasonable chance of defeat. The problem seems to be magnified, furthermore, when we turn from the large, relatively heterogeneous districts which elect congressmen and governors to the tightly knit areas which select state legislators and school boards.[16]

A major reason for one-party monopoly in many areas of the United States is the tendency toward sectional polarization on the part of economic, racial, religious and nationality groups. The various groups which make up the American population are not scattered in similar proportions in each constituency. The proportion of Catholics varies widely from Massachusetts to Iowa, and from Railroad Avenue to Hillcrest Drive. The same kind of variation occurs in the distribution of most groups significant in American politics.

To the extent that segments of the population can identify their political desires with the program of one party or the other, competition at the polls will be reduced in the United States, except in those fortunate constituencies where opposed groups are equally balanced. Such identification has already taken place in many districts, so that northern politics tends toward polarization between rural, Protestant, native districts, where Democrats cannot win, and metropolitan, immigrant, industrial districts, where they cannot lose.

---

[14] V. O. Key's *Southern Politics* (New York, 1949) is a testimonial to the fact that one-party factional politics, in which voters cannot depend on a known, organized opposition, is at best an inadequate means of maintaining honest, efficient, and responsible government. See especially pp. 44–52, 72, 105, 146, 181–84, 201, 310–11, 364, 400, 444, 498–99, 523, 655–56, 670.

[15] The number and percentage of victorious major party candidates who received various proportions of the major party vote in the 1948 congressional elections may be broken down as follows:

66.7–100% of vote—161 (37.1%)
60.0–66.7% of vote—80 (18.4%)
Below 60.0% of vote—193 (44.5%)

[16] For example, in the author's home state of Massachusetts, blessed with close party competition for the governorship, party monopoly exists in many local areas. A bona-fide Republican candidate for mayor of Boston in 1949 was rejected by Republican leaders in favor of an independent Democrat who stood a better chance in the non-partisan election. In some rural towns in the same state there is no Democratic committee and no Democratic town caucus or primary. Democrats must run as Independents or else enter the Republican caucus.

The reforms which the Committee proposes would increase the tendency toward one-party districts. If local parties and candidates cannot be insurgent, if they cannot express the basic desires of their constituencies, then those local parties can have no hope of success. Regardless of the organization provided, you cannot give Hubert Humphrey a banjo and expect him to carry Kansas. Only a Democrat who rejects at least a part of the Fair Deal can carry Kansas, and only a Republican who moderates the Republican platform can carry Massachusetts.

It may be argued that groups now dominant in the Republican and Democratic parties would be too wise and too patriotic to make drastic use of the recommended disciplinary powers. The record does not indicate such wisdom or patriotism. Only the lack of the means to control localities has prevented dominant groups from disciplining party members. Removal of conservative Democrats has been accomplished where possible, as in the case of Roger C. Slaughter in Kansas City or John M. Costello in Los Angeles. Conservative Republicans have likewise attempted to remove liberals, like Wayne Morse in Oregon and Charles W. Tobey in New Hampshire,[17] and have even given support to their Democratic opponents, as in the case of George Norris in Nebraska or Smith Brookhart in Iowa.

The ideological and geographical polarization of the parties which would result if the Committee's tools are used would not necessarily lead to violent upheaval.[18] The British example seems to demonstrate that disciplined parties can maintain peaceful relations, at least for a few years. But many services, which in the United States are performed by state and local agencies, are performed in Britain by national officers. Unless the Constitution is amended to place responsibility for state and local government on the shoulders of national officers (a proposal whose merits may be argued elsewhere), the plans of the Committee will only impede popular control of government.

Another unfortunate by-product of the Committee's proposals would affect the present opposition party, the Republicans. There is a tendency for party leaders to "put principle above politics" and to insist upon their own economic or social dogmas regardless of the popularity of such dogmas with the electorate. This tendency increases as the party's popularity decreases, because a decline in the party's membership reflects the withdrawal of dissident leaders who had previously moderated the policies formed by the ruling group. This trend, unless interrupted, would lead to the suicide of the minority party.

---

[17] The dilemma of Republican candidates in areas to which the Democratic national program appeals is illustrated by the remark of Joseph Clark Baldwin, former representative from New York City who was defeated by a conservative Republican: "For years now you've had to be a reactionary to get nominated in the Republican party and a liberal to be elected. Why should I continue to ride two horses and get a sore crotch?" *PM*, May 12, 1946, p. 4.

[18] Violent upheaval is nevertheless a possibility. The behavior of labor and business in some non-political activities suggests that these groups are not averse to violence. It is unfortunate that the report does not refer to the conclusions of leading writers on this subject. See Pendleton Herring, *The Politics of Democracy* (New York, 1940); Herbert Agar, *The Price of Union* (Boston, 1950).

The self-destructive tendencies of previous opposition parties have been offset, however, by changes in issues and by fortuitous political and economic developments[19] which have thrust the minority into power. With such sharp increases in power as the Democrats received in 1932 come fresh adherents to the party, who bring new and insurgent ideas to modify the party's previously unpalatable program.[20] Among the New Deal's new recruits we may note Henry Wallace, Harold Ickes, Harry Hopkins and Senator Paul Douglas.

The Committee's proposals for restrictions on the party program and membership may well prevent the Republicans, as issues change or accidents occur, from welcoming new ideas and new blood into the party. Since 1932 the minority has been attempting, with little success, to formulate a program which will receive the support of a majority of the voters. As long as the same groups within the party continue to dominate its appeal to the electorate, it is unlikely to win more than occasional skirmishes. The party is in great need of insurgents. The Committee might consequently devote its attention to the promotion of insurgency within the party rather than to reforms which will cement present groups in power.

The Committee supports several proposals of great value, such as reform of the Electoral College, a four-year term for Congress concurrent with the term of the President, and reform of representation in National Conventions to conform with state populations. These proposals would give the President, Congress, and the national convention more similar constituencies, and would help to decrease uncertainties in the interpretation of the popular mandate in elections. Electoral College reform, furthermore, would encourage each party to compete in areas monopolized by the other. Other excellent suggestions are made for the consultation of all party groups in the formulation of policy, for democratic control of party leadership, and for abolition of various forms of non-partisan and bi-partisan primaries. These reforms are needed, and would not lead to one-party monopoly. Those proposals, however, which would give greater power to dominant groups in either party should be rejected.

---

[19] Such as the Progressive split in the Republican convention of 1912, and the economic depression of 1929.

[20] For example, a Baltimore Democratic ward-heeler relates the amazement with which Democratic leaders viewed the switch of many Negroes to Democratic registration after 1932. "We didn't go out to get 'em. They just came in and asked to have their registration changed."

THE REAPPORTIONMENT OF CONGRESS*

The Constitution of the United States requires the seats in the House of Representatives to be redistributed after each decennial census. The American Political Science Association's Committee on Reapportionment of Congress has been considering what may desirably be done in consequence of the Census of 1950. The members reached six conclusions, as follows:

First, the size of the House of Representatives, which has been 435 for forty years and is fixed at that number by the present law, should not be changed except as the possible admission of Alaska or Hawaii as States may require a few more seats for their Representatives. In order to prevent any States from losing Congressmen under the recent census, 74 new seats would have to be put in the Chamber. A House of 509 seems impracticable. The personal relationships between a Congressman and his constituents would be much the same, whether an average district is 295,000 (with 509 seats) or 345,000 (with 435 seats). And any slight gain in human contacts would be vastly offset by losses in effectiveness and operation which would result from a considerably bigger House.

Second, there is no reason for changing at this time from the mathematical formula in the present Apportionment Act of 1941, namely, the method of equal proportions. Mr. Willcox dissents from this conclusion because he believes that the results of the method of equal proportions do not meet the requirements of the Constitutional provision "according to their respective numbers" as well as do the results of the method of major fractions. The other members are satisfied that the present method of equal proportions is the best method of meeting the Constitutional provision.

Third, all members of Congress to which any State is entitled should be elected by single-member districts, rather than at large. At present, if we disregard the four smallest states which have only one Representative, six Congressmen are elected at large. New Mexico and North Dakota choose all their members in this way (two each). And two states with large populations—Ohio and Connecticut—have each one Congressman at large.

These are merely examples of a practice which has occurred in other States in the past and may be used more extensively in the redistricting just ahead, unless prohibited by Congress. Whatever the motives for it, the device of Congressmen at large is very objectionable. Sometimes it may enable a political party having a slight lead in the State as a whole to get more seats in Congress than it could obtain if all the members were chosen by districts; this deprives the minority party of its just amount of representation. In any event, there is the gravest sort of inequality when most Congressmen represent an average district of roughly 350,000, but a Congressman at large from a State like Ohio or Connecticut represents millions of people.

---

* As a result of a number of requests from official agencies for information on the question of congressional reapportionment, former President Pollock authorized the Executive Director of the Washington office to appoint a special committee to prepare recommendations on this subject. On December 2 a committee, consisting of Messrs. Zechariah Chafee, Bertram M. Gross, John W. Lederle, Edward H. Litchfield, James K. Pollock, Robert S. Rankin, Laurence F. Schmeckebier and Walter F. Willcox, met in Washington under the Chairmanship of Professor Arthur N. Holcombe. The Committee's unanimous report, drafted by Professors Chafee and Holcombe, was made available to the White House, to members of Congress and to other official agencies which solicited it.

In all the apportionment statutes from 1842 to 1911 inclusive, Congress required every State to divide itself into single-member districts. This provision was omitted from the Act of 1929 and subsequent legislation. The Committee recommends that Congress enact new legislation reincorporating this desirable requirement.

Fourth, the Committee is agreed that wide variations in the size of Congressional districts inside any State are objectionable in principle and should be remedied in new legislation. The Committee has noted with concern the great disparities in the 1950 populations of existing Congressional districts. Take 350,000 as roughly the average in a district. In one State, there is a district under 175,000; six others under 250,000; three between 500,000 and 700,000; and one exceeding 900,000. In many states, the spread between 1950 populations in the smallest and the largest existing district in the State is two or three hundred thousand. Such situations, if continued, will seriously violate a basic principle of democracy, that every vote should have the same weight, as nearly as possible.

Therefore, the Committee earnestly suggests new legislation containing certain express standards of equality and fairness, as hereinafter described, which each State is to follow in its redistricting legislation. In many previous apportionments through that of 1911, Congress has imposed such standards on the States by requiring the districts to be composed of compact and contiguous territory and "containing as nearly as practicable the same number of individuals." Such provisions about districting are authorized by the Constitution (Article I, section 4), which gives Congress a comprehensive power to "make or alter . . . Regulations" of the "Times, Places and Manner of holding Elections for . . . Representatives," and the Supreme Court has repeatedly dealt with these provisions without expressing the slightest doubt as to their validity.

Unfortunately, these standards were omitted from the statutes which governed the apportionments after the censuses of 1930 and 1940. The Committee concludes that it would be desirable to reinstate them, and to express the standard of approximate equality among the districts with greater definiteness than hitherto.

The two concrete suggestions are:

1. That the standard requiring districts to be "compact and contiguous," found in the 1911 apportionment statute and omitted in the 1929 statute, should be included in a new law.

2. That the statute should include a standard limiting to a certain percentage the deviation of any district within the state upward or downward from the average of all districts for the state; and that an effort should be made to keep the deviation of any

district from the average of all districts for the state within a limit of ten per cent; but in any event such deviation should not be permitted to exceed fifteen per cent.

The practical effect of recommendation 3 would be to allow districts to vary over a range of about 100,000. This seems to make fair allowance for the practical difficulties which state legislators must face.

The particular percentages suggested are, of course, not essential, but the Committee believes that some such specification of the permissible variations from equality is very desirable.

Fifth, the Committee believes that the standards of approximate equality should be enforceable through an express sanction administered by Congress.

We feel that the statement of standards in the law will usually cause them to be observed. Our confidence in the legislatures and other appropriate authorities in the States leads to the expectation that they will, for the most part, faithfully obey the law of the land and establish districts for the next decade as Congress has directed them to do. Yet violations may occur, as has sometimes been the case under previous apportionment statutes containing standards. In these earlier statutes, Congress did not say what would happen to a State which divided itself in plainly unequal districts. Consequently, the unjust districting stood unchanged. Leaving any questions of gerrymandering to our sixth conclusion, we believe that departures from the percentage tests of approximate equality which we have just stated ought to be corrected and can practicably be corrected.

We rejected as undesirable several kinds of sanctions which have been proposed: (a) Any citizen might be given the right to question the districting inside his State, by a suit in a United States court. But the courts have shown great unwillingness to undertake the task of supervising Congressional districts, and might deny any constitutional power to do so. Even if they consented to do the job, we do not think that judges are well suited to weigh the political factors which inevitably affect districting. Finally, litigation might easily drag out for some years, whereas the new districts ought to be settled before the spring primaries in 1952. (b) A State which violated the standards of approximate equality laid down by Congress might be penalized by a refusal to seat its Representatives until this State made its districting conform to those standards and held new Congressional elections on that basis. This would probably make that State totally unrepresented in the House during one or more sessions of the Eighty-third Congress. Such a drastic punishment might be unconstitutional, and it was disapproved by the Committee. (c) The State might be required to elect all its Congressmen at large until it redistricted itself in accordance with the statutory standards. But the very same people who were responsible for the unequal districting might rejoice in having their Congressmen elected at large, because their party would thus choose the entire representation from this State in the House. And in any event, the Committee considered this sanction to be wholly inconsistent with our condemnation of Congressmen at large (in the Third Conclusion).

The only proper remedy for bad single-member districts is good single-member districts. The determination of approximately equal single-member districts is a political task, which ought to be performed by a legislative body. If the legislature of the State refuses to do the job, the only suitable alternative is for Congress to do it. Therefore, the Committee agreed that the task of supervising and correcting districting inside the State should be in the hands of Congress.

This led to the formation of a detailed plan for the imposition of sanctions. Its main features are: First, the States should be required to do their own redistricting soon after Congress passes the Apportionment Act; this will give Congress ample time to consider whether this action by the States complies with the statutory standards of approximate equality. Second, the President should transmit the results of State redistricting to Congress and to all the States, with information showing how any particular State has violated the statutory standards of approximate equality. Since the President's statement will appear in the press, unequal districting will be subjected to the powerful sanction of publicity. Third, Congress may then take such action as it deems proper. Congress may order the State to do the job over again. Or Congress may redistrict the State itself.

In order to accomplish this plan, the Committee recommends a schedule of steps to be included in federal law as follows:

(1) January 3, 1951 to January 10 (one week)—The President reports to Congress factual data furnished by the Bureau of the Census indicating the apportionment of Representatives among the several states under the 1950 census and according to the formula of "equal proportions."

(2) January 10 to late January (15 calendar days)—Congress considers the President's report, and unless it enacts a different apportionment within fifteen calendar days, each state shall automatically be entitled to the number of Representatives indicated in the President's report to Congress. The Clerk of the House shall so apprise the executive of each State; and the President will transmit to the States the data concerning populations supplied by the Bureau of the Census. The members of the Committee hope that, during the same period or very soon thereafter, Congress will enact legislation regulating districting inside the several States, substantially in accordance with the recommendations of this report.

(3) Late January to late April (90 days)—A period of ninety days will then be allowed for the necessary redistricting in State legislatures. In most states the legislatures will be regularly in session, and experience indicates that ninety days are a sufficient time for the enactment of the necessary redistricting laws.

(4) Late April to late May (30 days)—The President, on the basis of objective data furnished by the Bureau of the Census about the populations of the Congressional districts newly established by the state legislatures, will report to Congress and to the States as to conformity to or violation of the standards regulating the size of a district.

(5) After late May—Congress will take such action as it deems proper to correct unequal districting wherever it is shown by the President's report to exist.

The Committee anticipates that it will seldom be necessary for Congress to redistrict a State. The possibility of such redistricting by Congress and the publicity given to grossly unequal State action will, we hope, be powerful incentives to make the States comply with the statutory standards.

Sixth, the Committee discussed the problem of gerrymandering. It recognized that some gerrymandering is a serious evil, but decided against the recommendation of further sanctions at this time.

The members of the Committee share the hope that the re-establishment of the statutory standards of compactness and contiguity, and the publicity of the report to Congress on the action taken by state legislatures, will restrain those legislatures from seriously abusing the power to redistrict for purely partisan purposes.

NEWS AND NOTES

PROFESSIONAL CONFERENCES AND INSTITUTES

Forty-sixth Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association: Transactions of the Executive Council and General Business Meeting

The Executive Council of the American Political Science Association held its 1950 annual meeting in the Pan American Room of the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, D. C., on Wednesday, December 27, 1950. The meeting was called to order at 9:45 A.M. by President James K. Pollock. On roll call the following officers and members of the Council were found to be present: President Pollock, President-Elect Peter H. Odegard, Vice-Presidents Oliver P. Field and Robert J. Harris, Managing Editor Taylor Cole, Secretary-Treasurer Harvey Walker, Executive Director Edward H. Litchfield, Joseph M. Ray, J. B. Shannon, Matthew C. Mitchell, Robert K. Carr, G. Homer Durham, Albert Lepawsky, Harvey C. Mansfield, Carl B. Swisher, Kenneth C. Cole, John D. Millett and Francis O. Wilcox. In addition to these, the following committee chairmen and members were present at one time or another during the meeting: Catheryn Seckler-Hudson, William C. Johnstone, Jr., Harold Lasswell, Frederic A. Ogg, Royden Dangerfield, Ben A. Arneson, Arthur N. Holcombe, Marshall E. Dimock, Belle Zeller, Pitman B. Potter, Roscoe C. Martin, John E. Briggs, Thomas S. Barclay, Patterson French, Kirk Porter and Benjamin M. Ziegler.

The chairman of the Program Committee, William C. Johnstone, Jr., gave an oral report. He pointed out that both the size of the Association membership and the anticipated attendance necessitated the use of two hotels, the Mayflower and the Statler, for the program, and that the limited availability of rooms with adequate seating capacity to serve the interests of the membership restricted the number of round table and section meetings which could be scheduled. Considering these limitations, the Committee had constructed the program according to five basic principles: (1) within the limited number of round table sessions each substantive field and major interest of the membership was covered, even though many specific topics of interest to individual members were not included; (2) the standing committees of the Association were utilized to the greatest possible extent, each committee being given responsibility for organizing round table sessions in its field of competence; (3) one open general session and two luncheon sessions were scheduled to give an opportunity for all the members to hear outstanding speakers; (4) a special evening series of simultaneous meetings on the general topic "Issues before the Congress" was scheduled in response to suggestions from a number of members of the Association; and (5) the sessions were so divided between the two hotels as to serve the interest of the members and to allow time between sessions to move from one hotel to the other.

The president then called upon Catheryn Seckler-Hudson, chairman of the Committee on Local Arrangements, for her report. She summarized the contents of a mimeographed statement which was available for the use of the Council. She indicated that the Committee had divided the responsibility for local arrangements as follows: public relations, Eli E. Nobleman; registration, J. M. Ray; special events, Elmer Staats; facilities, Catheryn Seckler-Hudson. In addition, Lowell H. Hattery served as administrative secretary for the Committee. Approximately fifty graduate students from American University, Catholic University, George Washington University, Georgetown University, Howard University, the University of Maryland and Trinity College served as monitors, messengers, information personnel and in other necessary capacities. Press releases were sent to eighty press services, newspapers, news magazines, columnists and correspondents by the public relations section. Arrangements were made with the National Broadcasting Company to broadcast a program based on the round table on "Civil Defense in the Atomic Age." A pressroom was provided at the Mayflower Hotel and press liaison at the Statler. Registration was provided at both headquarters hotels, and advance registration had been taken for the first time in the history of the Association. A number of special events were scheduled through the good offices of this Committee, including receptions at the Brazilian, Korean and Australian embassies, and a number of breakfasts and dinners were arranged. Round table chairmen had been asked in advance to indicate the facilities which they desired, and the necessary equipment and arrangements were provided.

President Pollock summarized orally the activities of the Executive Committee. He first indicated that under the constitutional amendments which became effective January 1, 1950, it had been necessary for him to appoint an Executive Committee consisting of the president, the president-elect, the chairman of the Program Committee and the secretary-treasurer (until the creation of the Washington office, and then the director of the Washington office), all *ex officio*, plus two persons appointed by the president. The appointees for 1950 were Lloyd Short of the University of Minnesota and Pendleton Herring of the Social Science Research Council.

In the course of the year the Executive Committee met three times—in Washington on March 9, in Ann Arbor on June 24, and again in Washington on October 12. These meetings were concerned mainly with carrying out the mandate of the Association, adopted at its business meeting in New York in 1949, concerning the opening of the Washington office, and a committee, of which Roscoe C. Martin was chairman, was appointed to plan the needed changes. The Washington office was opened on October 2 in temporary quarters in the DuPont Circle Building; on December 27, the day of the Council meeting, it moved to its more permanent headquarters in the American Council on Education Building, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue, N. W. All of the physical property of the Association was moved from the office of the secretary-treasurer to Washington on October 5. Edward H. Litchfield was appointed director, and he in turn appointed Ralph J. D. Braibanti as assistant director, together with the necessary office staff.

Other topics considered by the Executive Committee during the year included reports from the newly-elected managing editor, Taylor Cole, and a number of problems arising out of the work of several of the committees, particularly those on the Advancement of Teaching, on Political Parties and on American Legislatures. Pursuant to the mandate of the New York Council meeting, the Executive Committee prepared and adopted a statement of publication policy governing the issuance of committee reports. When the report of the Committee on Political Parties was ready for issuance, a special ceremony was arranged in Washington at which it was presented to the press by E. E. Schattschneider, chairman of the Committee on Political Parties, and the members of the Executive Committee. This report was first published as a supplement to the September issue of the REVIEW; cloth-bound copies for class use are now being issued by Rinehart & Company under a contract which provides that royalties on the sale will accrue to the benefit of the endowment fund of the Association. A similar pattern will be followed by the Committee on the Advancement of Teaching in the publication and distribution of its report.

During the course of the year the Executive Committee felt that it was desirable to appoint two additional Association committees. One of them was created to deal with a problem referred to the officers of the Association by the national government, that of the reapportionment of Congress. The report of this committee, prepared under the chairmanship of Arthur N. Holcombe, will be published in the March issue of the REVIEW. The second new organ was a Membership Committee, which includes a number of prominent members of the Association with membership chairmen in each of the states and territories.

The president reported to the Council that he had appointed Charles Fairman of Stanford University to represent the American Political Science Association on the Social Science Research Council and Kenneth Colegrove of Northwestern University as the representative of the Association on the American Council of Learned Societies. After consultation with the president-elect, he also appointed Quincy Wright, James K. Pollock and Peter H. Odegard as the representatives of the American Political Science Association on the Council of the International Political Science Association.

President Pollock then reported to the Council on the events leading to the formation of the International Political Science Association and the part the American Political Science Association had played, both in its formation and in its subsequent operation. He spoke of the important role of Walter Sharp in drafting the constitution of the international group and of the invaluable assistance rendered by Walter H. C. Laves, deputy director general of UNESCO, in the implementation of its program. The president read the following statement from Jean Meynaud, secretary general of the International Association:

> Mr. Chairman, and members of the American Political Science Association,
>
> This time last year your Association decided to join the International Political Science Association just formed in Paris and to assist it generously. This meant that you showed

great trust in our Association. Today, after one year's work, we may sum up our activity and make some plans for the future.

The Association started effectively to function in the first months of 1950. As was to be foreseen, because of its international recruitment and of its aims, its beginnings were rather long and difficult. We are far from realizing all we wished. However, our Association counts already more than ten national member associations. In many other countries it has investigated the establishment of new associations. We have been able to establish many very useful contacts with political scientists and institutions in most parts of the world.

The First World Congress on Political Science, last September, gave us the opportunity for gathering together, on a somewhat modest scale, about eighty political scientists belonging to twenty-three countries. Our administrative body is now organized and we have at our disposal a documentation which will allow us to start an important work. We shall begin in the next few weeks carrying out an extensive inquiry into the teaching of political science throughout the world, and our Research Committee is setting up a subject for the study of which we will ask the assistance of all national associations and which will constitute the main theme of the Second World Congress of Political Science, to be held in 1952.

What we have done up to now is relatively little. We are desirous of realizing important achievements. We are conscious of all our faults, but the impulse seems to be there and we ask once more for your confidence.

This confidence is the more indispensable for us as our Association can not achieve anything serious or important without the complete assistance of vital national associations. We would like to avoid becoming an administrative engine which could only superimpose its activity on already existing bodies. On the contrary, we wish to serve as a medium for exchange of information, a center for contacts between political scientists in the world, to allow them to become better acquainted and to work together in a spirit of complete fairness and scientific activity. The work we would like to promote is the starting and the co-ordinating of extensive research and important inquiries, in which we would ask every member association to participate with its integral contribution and its own possibilities and from which we will make every effort to draw conclusions by means of organizing congresses and round tables or, more simply, by joint work meetings.

By reason of its very high achievement and of its particularly brilliant development, American political science has a great responsibility in our Association. You and your members have already done your utmost to fulfill this responsibility by assisting our efforts. We are proud to have as our President one of your past Presidents, one of the leading political scientists in the world: Professor Quincy Wright. We never shall forget that our Association owes its beginnings to the tenacious work of Professor Walter R. Sharp, at the time he worked in the Social Science Department of UNESCO. At Zurich, we had the pleasure of greeting an American delegation of fifteen or so members, led by your President, Professor James K. Pollock.

It would take too much time to name here all those of your members who assisted my efforts and who advised me since the inception of the Association: I would like to express my thanks collectively to them. I wish also to say that the International Political Science Association is at your disposal for every help. I would like it to become your second Association and we welcome all those of you who would wish to become individual members.

We will reach together the aims outlined by the founders of the International Political Science Association: to promote the advancement of political science throughout the world. There is magnificent work to be done by us, especially in spreading political science in those countries where it represents yet an unknown field.

But our Association has another fundamental part to play. That is, to quote Professor Lasswell, "to bring to completion the revolutionary process of our historical period." Our paramount aim should be to contribute to the advancement of a human society, on a national and international scale, where man, freed from need and fear, will be able to develop fully his possibilities.

Beyond the technical problems of the different parts of our program, our Association's program and action ought to contribute to a better understanding among nations. This is a condition of peace. Our world is difficult; but those difficulties are for us an encouragement to action and we know that we can count on full assistance from your Association.

Mr. Chairman, members of the American Political Science Association, the International Political Science Association wishes many years of prosperity for your Association.

/s/JEAN MEYNAUD

In the discussion which followed this report, President Pollock pointed out that while the next meeting of the International Association would not occur until 1952, it was contemplated that there might be meetings of its Council in the interim. The program of the international group for 1951 has been determined by the interim organization and will consist primarily in a comparative report on the teaching of political science in the various countries of the world. On the recommendation of Quincy Wright, Marshall E. Dimock, chairman of the Committee on the Advancement of Teaching, was appointed United States representative on the panel which is preparing this report and to serve as one of the *rapporteurs*.

Harold Lasswell, as chairman of the Committee on Research, reported that at the request of the International Association his committee had prepared a list of suggestions for needed research in the international field. President Pollock reported that conferences of international and European national groups in this area were attended in 1949 by Quincy Wright, and in 1950 by Quincy Wright and himself, together with other members of the Association who were available in Europe at the time of the Zurich meeting in September, 1950.

The report of the secretary-treasurer was presented by Harvey Walker. He explained the difficulties arising from divided responsibility for both receipts and expenditures during the year 1950, due to the opening of the Washington office. It was clear, nevertheless, that expenditures during the year had followed closely the estimates made and approved at the New York meeting. Total actual receipts for the fiscal year ending November 30, 1950, were $51,546.63, while expenses for the period amounted to $42,764.91, leaving an excess of income over expenses for this period of $8,781.72. This surplus is due largely to the receipt from the Carnegie Corporation of a grant of $10,000, which the Executive Committee decided should be used over a two-year period to supplement other available funds for the opening of the Washington office. Cash on hand and in the bank as of November 30, 1950, was $23,462.41. This, together with other assets, produced a total of $25,437.28, against liabilities consisting of prepaid dues and deferred income of $14,908.23, leaving a general fund surplus of $10,162.35. The trust funds of the Association showed a total of $7,564.32 in the endowment fund and $16,229.70 in the general trust and reserve funds. In addition, there was a balance of $5,598.86 from a total grant of $10,000 from the Carnegie Corporation for the uses and purposes of the Committee on the Advancement of Teaching.

The secretary-treasurer reported that most of the funds and securities of the Association had been transferred to the custody of the Washington office, and that the balance in all funds would follow shortly after the beginning of the year. One reason for the delay was his desire to take advantage of the interest payment date on two building and loan deposits as of the 31st of December, 1950.

The secretary-treasurer also presented a report from the auditor, Harold J. Bobys of Washington, D. C. The auditor reported that the financial statements of the current operating account and the trust funds fairly present the financial condition as of November 30, 1950, and the results of operations for the fiscal year ending the same date. On motion of President-Elect Odegard, seconded by J. B. Shannon, the report of the secretary-treasurer was approved with an expression of appreciation to him for his services. The report of the auditor was also approved and filed.

Some discussion of possible adjustments in the schedule of dues followed. However, no action was taken, and it was indicated that this subject would receive some attention by the Executive Committee during the following year.

Edward H. Litchfield made his first report to the Council as director of the Washington office. He indicated that much of what he planned to say already had been covered. He pointed out that the office had been in operation for less than ninety days, and that since no personnel had been transferred from the office of the secretary-treasurer it had been necessary to establish an entirely new staff. He indicated that the staff now employed was all that the budget permitted, although it was not large enough to take care of all of the services which the members seemed to desire. All of the staff members are college graduates, trained in the social sciences. Members of the Council were invited to visit the new offices.

The director then presented his budget for the fiscal year ending November 30, 1951. He indicated that, in view of the lack of experience with the operation of an office on a basis similar to the one on which the Washington office now stands, the estimates could not be much more than guesses. However, he felt that the amounts suggested would be adequate for carrying on current services during the fiscal year. He indicated that there had been a seven per cent increase in membership since the opening of the Washington office—partly from increased interest in the Washington area. He expressed the hope that the new Membership Committee would succeed in stimulating a similar increase in other parts of the country.

The director of the Washington office then turned to problems of function, which he discussed under the following headings: (1) personnel service; (2) assistance in research programs; (3) reference service for members; (4) service to federal agencies; and (5) miscellaneous business. Under the first heading, he suggested the possible establishment of a roster for the political science profession in cooperation with the federal government. He felt that the nature of the personnel service had changed somewhat with the opening of the Washington office, so that it now served not only junior but also senior members of the profession. Likewise, placement was not only in teaching positions but also in government service. He indicated that arrangements had been made for interviews by a number of government agencies with possible job applicants during the course of the current meeting.

In connection with the second function, he suggested the desirability of sufficient additional support from foundations or other sources to enable the Association to employ a professional staff which could serve committees. He also mentioned the desirability of extending information about the Association to areas where it is not so well known. He cited the example of the report of the Committee on Political Parties and the inquiries which it stimulated. He thought that new markets were needed for the ideas of the research committees of the Association.

In the discussion which followed, the director was asked whether or not the Washington office would undertake to watch congressional legislation of interest to the members. The director felt that this should be done, but that it could not be done adequately with the present staff. Several members of the Council emphasized the importance of avoiding any pressure activities, but the president-elect indicated that he felt the Association could render some service in this area without engaging in lobbying. On motion of the secretary-treasurer, seconded by John D. Millett, the budget was approved and power was delegated to the Executive Committee to make any transfers which might be necessary within the budget total of $61,152.

Belle Zeller presented an oral report for the Committee on American Legislatures. She indicated that an extended report had been prepared by the Committee and that copies of several chapters had been sent to members of the Executive Committee for comment. She felt that in a few months it would be possible to have the report in final form and that, after approval by the Executive Committee, in accordance with the publication policy, arrangements for publication could be made with a commercial concern. She asked that provision be made for two additional meetings of the Committee in Washington for this purpose. On motion of the secretary-treasurer, seconded by the president-elect, the Committee was continued for another year and the questions of financing the meeting and of the publication were referred to the Executive Committee.

John E. Briggs presented a report for the Committee on Regional Societies. While the Committee felt that it would not be feasible to prescribe precise geographical boundaries for the regional groups, it approved the suggestion of making regional meetings available to members in all parts of the country. The Committee had discussed a suggestion from the Executive Committee that a plan for more complete geographical coverage be explored by the Committee on Regional Societies, particularly in view of the fact that several states now lie outside any existing regional association. The Committee recommended (1) that the policy of encouraging the voluntary organization of regional political science societies to satisfy recognized needs should be continued by the Association, (2) that the formation of a Missouri Valley political science association be facilitated, (3) that regional associations should be organized in such fashion as to be eligible for recognition as sections of the American Political Science Association, and (4) that the New York Political Science Association be recognized by the Council as a section of the national Association. On motion of the secretary-treasurer, seconded by Matthew C. Mitchell, the recommendations were approved and the Committee was continued with the understanding that during 1951 it should consist of the presidents of the several regional societies.

At this point the Council recessed for luncheon.

Following the luncheon, President Pollock read the following letter from President Harry S. Truman:

THE WHITE HOUSE
Washington

December 22, 1950

Dear Dr. Pollock:

I wish to extend my greetings and good wishes to the members of the American Political Science Association as they assemble for their forty-sixth annual meeting.

In recent years, through such agencies as the Committee on Congress and the Committee on Political Parties, your association has presented wise and constructive proposals for the improvement of our governmental machinery.

In this time of national emergency, it is even more vital that we take all necessary steps to make our democracy work better. The strength of democracy stems from popular participation in the Government and popular support of our free institutions. Unfortunately, in the past ten years we have seen a marked decline in the percentage of eligible voters who go to the polls. This is a serious matter which challenges the interest of all citizens, regardless of party affiliation.

I would welcome the advice of the American Political Science Association on what steps should be taken by our people to halt this downward trend in voting and to increase citizen participation in government. Perhaps an initial study by a non-partisan commission might reveal the extent of voting and non-voting, and give us a clearer understanding of why the percentage of voters is declining and what can be done about it. I believe that the American Political Science Association, because of its particular interest in this field, may have some valuable suggestions as to how the various branches of government, Federal, state and local, and the interested citizens' groups, can approach this vital matter.

In our lifetime, we have seen the forces of dictatorship endanger democratic institutions in one country after another. We must recognize, here in this country, that the preservation of the institutions of freedom is everybody's job. We should strengthen democracy at home at the same time as we help to strengthen the free Nations throughout the world.

Very sincerely yours,
HARRY S. TRUMAN

Dr. James K. Pollock,
President,
The American Political Science Association,
DuPont Circle Building,
Washington, D. C.

The discussion which followed the reading of the letter indicated sincere appreciation on the part of the Council and a desire to respond to the challenge with constructive suggestions. The whole matter was referred to the incoming officers.

Pitman B. Potter presented a report for the Committee on International Cultural Relations. The activities of the Committee during the year have been varied. They have included contact with the SSRC on the Fulbright program, the supplying of information to the Commission on Occupied Areas of the American Council on Education, assistance in the planning of the conference of the International Political Science Association, and maintenance of contact with the Department of State and the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization and other specialized agencies of the United Nations, as well as with the Division of International Educational Relations of the Federal Security Agency and the Institute of International Relations. In discussing the report of the Committee, President-Elect Odegard proposed a wider recognition in the committee structure of the problem of area study. He suggested the formation of three new committee groups to supplement the one already in existence on Latin America, in order to provide coordination of area studies in the Far East, Eastern Europe and the USSR, and Western Europe. The Council agreed that the Committee should be continued under the name of "Committee on International Relations," that it should be relieved of further responsibility for the work formerly performed by the Committee on Aid to Foreign Universities, and that, if possible, provision should be made for meetings of the Committee.

The secretary-treasurer read a letter from the Institute of Public Administration in London, acknowledging receipt of a file of the AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE REVIEW for the Institute's permanent library. The policy of distribution of back numbers of the REVIEW was discussed, and it was agreed that the distribution of these numbers should be determined by the Executive Committee in the light of the available stock and the budget.

The president-elect asked for discussion by the Council of the question of whether the appointive members of the Executive Committee should be chosen from within or from outside the Council membership. After considerable discussion the consensus of the Council was that appointive members should be chosen from the Council.

Marshall E. Dimock presented a report for the Committee on the Advancement of Teaching. He indicated that the principal activity of the Committee during the year past was the preparation of the manuscript for the Committee's report, which is to be published early in 1951 by William Sloane Associates of New York. The intensive work in the preparation of the manuscript and the collection of data upon which the report is to be based were made possible by a grant of $10,000 from the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. The publisher has agreed to supply a copy of the report to each member of the Association. Additional copies will be sold and royalties will be paid for the benefit of the endowment fund of the Association. On motion of the president-elect, seconded by Carl B. Swisher, the report was accepted and the Committee continued. In the discussion of this motion, the Council members commended the policy adopted by the Program Committee for the Washington meeting in scheduling discussion sessions to be led by committees which are in the process of preparing, or which have recently issued, extensive reports.

Roscoe C. Martin presented a final report for the Washington Office Committee. This report summarized the steps leading to the opening of the headquarters office. On motion of the secretary-treasurer, seconded by Kenneth Cole, the Committee was discharged with the sincere thanks of the Council for its arduous and successful labors.

Harold Lasswell presented an oral report for the Committee on Research. He pointed out that many of the committees of the Association are engaged in research and that hence there might be some question about the desirability of having a separate committee on research. He suggested that there were two separate problems in the research field—first, that of method and procedure, and, second, that of policy and operations. The Committee on Research should, he felt, concern itself primarily with the first of these. To carry out this idea, the Committee accepted responsibility for the conduct of three round tables at the Washington meeting. The chairman described at some length the plans of the United States Office of Education for a survey of research in the United States in the field of political science. He indicated that this survey was now in progress and that, at the request of the Bureau of the Budget, it had been extended to include all of the social sciences. He felt that it was important that the Association continue to cooperate in this ambitious project. It was agreed by the Council that the Committee should be continued, that the Washington office should take over the direct contacts with the United States Office of Education and that a letter of appreciation be written to the Office of Education commending its initiative in instituting this study. The resolution of appreciation, prepared by the chairman of the Committee and adopted by the Council for submission to the business meeting, is as follows:

> RESOLVED: That the American Political Science Association commends the United States Office of Education for its initiative in conducting a national survey of research in progress in political science. This study served as the basis for planning those sections of the 46th Annual Meeting devoted to research. It is the hope of the Association that the United States Office of Education, so admirably suited for such studies, may continue to conduct similar surveys on an annual basis.
>
> RESOLVED FURTHER: That the secretary-treasurer send a copy of this resolution to the United States Commissioner of Education, the Director of the Division of Higher Education of the United States Office of Education, and the Director of the United States Bureau of the Budget.

Arthur N. Holcombe presented a report for the Committee on Science and Technology. This Committee held a significant meeting in Ann Arbor, Michigan, on July 26–27, 1950, which was made possible by a grant of travel funds from the Social Science Research Council. Three subcommittees have been formed to explore areas within the Committees' competence. On motion of J. B. Shannon, seconded by Robert J. Harris, the Committee was continued and the officers were directed to solicit foundation support for furthering its work.

Frederic A. Ogg presented the report of the Committee on Awards. This report described the personnel of the panels and the procedure which had been used in carrying out the Committee's task. A total of seventy-two books was considered and the chairman indicated that the results would be announced at a session on the first evening of the annual meeting. On recommendation of the chairman, the Council voted to direct the secretary to convey to the Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt and Wendell L. Willkie foundations an expression of the Association's appreciation and thanks. A similar expression was also to be made to Mr. Frank Altschul of New York, who rendered for the Association the valuable service of printing gratis the scrolls which symbolized the awards. The Council also agreed that the awards program should be continued.

Royden J. Dangerfield made a report on Department of State publications, indicating the present status of the various series and volumes. He presented the following resolution, which was unamimously approved by the Council, for recommendation to the business meeting of the Association:

BE IT RESOLVED:

(1) That the American Political Science Association express to the Department of State its appreciation for the publication during 1950 of *Post-War Foreign Policy Preparation, 1939–45*, Volume III of *Documents on German Foreign Policy, 1918–45*, *Germany, 1947–1949: The Story in Documents*, the quarterly reports of the High Commissioner for Germany and of the High Commissioner for Austria. These publications are of great value to political scientists interested in American foreign policy.

(2) That the Association express to the Department of State the hope that it (a) will endeavor to push the preparation and publication of *Foreign Relations of the United States* so as to close the gap between the event and the publication of documents (now seventeen years) to ten years; (b) will reconsider its decision to discontinue work on the Hunter Miller edition of *Treaties and other International Acts of the United States of America;* (c) will push the work on *U. S. Treaty Developments;* and (d) will increase the amount of documentation published in the *Department of State Bulletin.*

(3) That the appropriations committees of the two houses be asked to provide adequate funds for improving and extending the publication programs of the Department of State.

(4) That the Association commend the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations for the publication of *A Decade of American Foreign Policy: Basic Documents, 1941–49*, and ask the Committee to undertake the task of bringing the Malloy treaty volumes up to date.

(5) That the Secretary be asked to call these resolutions to the attention of the Department of State and the appropriate congressional committees.

It was felt that with the opening of the Washington office there was no longer a need for a special committee on Department of State publications, and the functions of this committee were made part of the duties of the Washington office.

The report of the Committee on Citizen Participation in Politics was presented by the chairman, Ben A. Arneson. He indicated a number of significant activities during the year, both by the Committee and by other cooperating organizations. On motion of John D. Millett, seconded by J. B. Shannon, it was voted to continue the Committee and to refer, with the general approval of the Council, to the new Committee the recommendations presented. It was pointed out in the discussion of this motion that this Committee should play a vitally important part in the Association's program in response to the letter from the White House which had been read earlier.

Managing Editor Taylor Cole presented a report covering his first year in that office. A total of 1,120 pages were published in the REVIEW, plus 99 pages of supplement. Of this number, approximately 1,100 pages consisted of text. The managing editor reported that substantial increases have already occurred in the cost of paper and printing and that others were in prospect. He indicated that the advertising rates in the REVIEW were being increased. The managing editor nominated the following persons for membership on the editorial board for 1951: Harold Zink, associate editor, Ohio State University; James W. Fesler, associate editor, University of North Carolina; Frederic A. Ogg, University of Wisconsin; Franz Neumann, Columbia University; Merle Fainsod, Harvard University; Charles S. Hyneman, Northwestern University; and Philip W. Buck, Stanford University. On motion of Robert J. Harris, seconded by John D. Millett, the persons recommended by the managing editor were elected to serve as the Board of Editors of the AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE REVIEW for 1951.

The secretary-treasurer read a memorandum from the Committee on Labor Management Relations, prepared by individual members of the committee, and indicated that this memorandum would serve as a basis for discussion at a meeting of the Committee to be held on December 28. On motion of G. Homer Durham, seconded by J. B. Shannon, this Committee was continued.

In the absence of Elmer E. Schattschneider, chairman of the Committee on Political Parties, President-Elect Odegard indicated that the principal contribution of this Committee had been its published report which appeared as a supplement to the September issue of the REVIEW. He felt that the Committee desired to continue with its investigations and that it would emphasize during the coming year the nominating processes, particularly the direct primary. On motion of the president-elect, seconded by the secretary-treasurer, it was voted to continue the Committee and to express to it the thanks of the Council for its most effective and interesting report.

The secretary-treasurer summarized the report for the Committee on Latin American Affairs, in the absence of Russell B. Fitzgibbon, chairman. The report indicated that the Committee had made formal application to one of the foundations for a considerable sum to assist in the field study necessary for a series of monographic studies on the political and governmental systems of selected Latin American states. A comprehensive bibliography of works dealing with Latin American governments and politics had been prepared during the year by a member of the Committee and was published by the Pan American Union.

Arthur N. Holcombe summarized briefly a report on the subject of reapportionment of Congress, prepared by a committee, under his chairmanship, created in response to a request from several government agencies. President Pollock indicated that this report was a typical example of the service which the Association would now be able to render to the government through its new Washington office.

Thomas S. Barclay presented the report of the Committee on Nominations. The names submitted for the various offices were as follows: president-elect, Luther H. Gulick, director of the Institute of Public Administration; vice-presidents, Paul H. Appleby (Syracuse University), J. Alton Burdine (University of Texas) and George B. Galloway (Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress); members of the Council for two years, M. Margaret Ball (Wellesley College), Wilfred E. Binkley (Ohio Northern University), Ray F. Harvey (New York University), Royden J. Dangerfield (University of Illinois), Alpheus T. Mason (Princeton University), James L. McCamy (University of Wisconsin), Roy V. Peel (director, Bureau of the Census), and Edward W. Weidner (Michigan State College). On motion of the secretary-treasurer, seconded by G. Homer Durham, it was voted to recommend to the business meeting the election of the persons nominated by the Committee on Nominations, subject to nominations from the floor.

President-Elect Odegard reported on program and arrangements for the 1951 meeting, which is to be held at the Fairmont and Mark Hopkins hotels in San Francisco, California, August 28–30. The chairman of the Program Committee is J. A. C. Grant, of the University of California at Los Angeles, and the chairman of the Committee on Local Arrangements is George Lipsky, of the University of California at Berkeley.

The secretary-treasurer reported that arrangements were completed for holding the 1952 meeting on August 26–28 at the Hotel Statler, Buffalo, New York. The director of the Washington office indicated that invitations for the 1953 meeting had been received from Washington, New York and Chicago, and that others could be anticipated. The secretary-treasurer delivered to the director of the Washington office an invitation from the City of Columbus, Ohio, for the 1953 meeting as a part of the state's sesquicentennial celebration.

On motion of John D. Millett, seconded by Matthew C. Mitchell, Edward H. Litchfield was elected secretary-treasurer to serve until the end of the 1951 annual meeting. After some discussion of the provisions of the present constitution of the Association, the president-elect and the Executive Committee were directed by the Council to institute a revision of the constitution to provide all of the needed changes which arise from the establishment of the Washington office.

Roscoe C. Martin and Patterson French presented a proposed certificate of incorporation for the Association under the District of Columbia law. It was moved by Francis O. Wilcox, seconded by Robert J. Harris, that the Council approve the proposed certificate of incorporation and direct Patterson French and the Washington office to proceed with the incorporation. On motion of the secretary-treasurer, seconded by Robert J. Harris, the Executive Committee was directed to prepare and submit the necessary bylaws to a mail ballot of the Council.

At this point the Council adjourned for dinner. Following the dinner, President Pollock and President-Elect Odegard discussed with the Council the application which had been made by them on behalf of the Association to the trustees of the Ford Foundation for a grant of funds. Such funds would permit the Association to canvass the areas in which it might be of service in accomplishing the purposes of the Foundation. The report of the committee appointed by the Foundation to outline a program and policy was commended to the Council as important reading for all its members. It was suggested that this report presents a challenge to all social scientists, particularly to political scientists. The report is oriented, not by disciplines, however, but by problem areas.

President-Elect Odegard recommended that the Association establish a committee on research planning and policy to explore the opportunities for service which lie within our disciplinary area. He also recommended the creation of the following committees, which he felt were needed in order to round out the Association's program of service to its members and to the general public: a committee on public administration, a committee on national defense, and three new area committees, namely on the Far East, on Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, and on Western Europe. On motion of Robert J. Harris, seconded by John D. Millett, these recommendations of the president-elect were approved.

On motion of J. B. Shannon, seconded by Oliver P. Field, the Washington office staff was directed to proceed with the roster project recommended earlier by the director of the Washington office.

Robert K. Carr proposed the establishment of a committee on national security and individual freedom. He stated that this proposal had also the support of Harold Lasswell. This proposal was referred to the Executive Committee with power to act if such action be found desirable.

It was reported that the director of the Census, Roy V. Peel, desired the appointment by the Association of a committee to advise him in connection with census problems. The president-elect was authorized by the Council to appoint an *ad hoc* committee for such a purpose if he deemed it necessary or desirable.

The Council was adjourned at 8:20 P.M.

The annual business meeting of the American Political Science Association was held in the Grand Ball Room of the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., on December 29, 1950. The meeting was called to order at 4:50 P.M. by President James K. Pollock, who then announced that a quorum was present and presented to the membership a report on the establishment of the Washington office. He introduced the director of the Washington office, Edward H. Litchfield, who spoke briefly on his plans for the development of the services of the office and introduced Ralph J. D. Braibanti, his assistant. It was reported that the Association was in the process of incorporation.

William A. Robson, Walter H. C. Laves, Walter Sharp, Quincy Wright and President Pollock then spoke on the International Political Science Association. The facts concerning the establishment of this new organization are reported in the December issue of the AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE REVIEW. The support of the Association for the international organization, through individual memberships and through contributions to the *International Social Science Bulletin* of UNESCO, was solicited by the speakers.

The activities of the Association in the field of publication were next reviewed. Managing Editor Taylor Cole presented a report on his first year in that office, and listed the names of the Board of Editors for 1951, as approved by the Council.

President Pollock reported briefly for Elmer E. Schattschneider on the publication of the report of the Committee on Political Parties in October.

Marshall E. Dimock reported that his Committee on Advancement of Teaching had completed its report and that publication could be expected in the spring. He spoke also of the project of the International Political Science Association for the comparative study of the teaching of political science in different countries. President Pollock indicated that Chairman Dimock would serve as the representative of the American Political Science Association and of political scientists in the United States in this project.

Belle Zeller, chairman of the Committee on American Legislatures, indicated that a report of that Committee containing recommendations for the improvement of state legislatures was in draft form and that completion of the report could be expected during the 1951 Association year.

At this point the secretary-treasurer reported to the membership on the actions taken by the Council at its meeting on December 27. (For the details, see the report of the Council meeting which precedes.)

Secretary-Treasurer Walker, on behalf of the Council, presented, for consideration by the members, the resolution approved by the Council commending the United States Department of Education for its initiative in inaugurating a survey of political science research in progress, and the Council-approved resolution on publications of the United States Department of State (for the text of both resolutions, see the minutes of the Council meeting which precede). On motion of the secretary-treasurer, these resolutions were unanimously approved by the members. The following resolutions of thanks were presented for consideration by the membership, and were approved by unanimous vote:

RESOLVED: That the American Political Science Association, assembled in Washington for its 46th Annual Meeting, express its sincere appreciation to the Committee on Program under the chairmanship of William C. Johnstone for the excellent meeting which it has developed, and to the very able Committee on Local Arrangements under the chairmanship of Catheryn Seckler-Hudson for the smoothness and efficiency with which the meeting has proceeded.

RESOLVED: That the Association express its appreciation to the management of the Mayflower Hotel and the Statler Hotel, and to the Washington Convention Bureau, for the excellent hospitality which they have afforded during our 46th Annual Meeting.

RESOLVED: That the Association record its deep appreciation to the American University, George Washington University, Georgetown University, Catholic University, University of Maryland, Howard University and Trinity College, to their officers, faculty and students for their indispensable assistance in planning and carrying forward the 46th Annual Meeting.

Thomas S. Barclay, chairman of the Committee on Nominations, presented the report of his Committee. (For the names placed in nomination, see the report of the Council which precedes.) President Pollock asked if there were nominations from the floor. As there were none, on motion of the chairman of the Committee the persons nominated were unanimously elected to the offices indicated in the report.

The secretary-treasurer announced that the 1951 annual meeting would be held at the Fairmont and Mark Hopkins hotels in San Francisco, California, on August 28–30, and that the 1952 annual meeting would be held at the Statler Hotel in Buffalo, New York, on August 26–28.

At this point William Anderson made the following motion:

> I make a motion expressing thanks of this Association to Mr. Harvey Walker for his very loyal and faithful services to this Association, first as assistant to our former secretary-treasurer, Mr. Colegrove, and later as secretary-treasurer of the Association in his own official capacity. We all know Harvey Walker and the faithful work he has done for this Association in conducting the placement service for a long time before he had any official title for that service, and for the rest of the work he did before he became secretary-treasurer. I think the Association should make a motion of sincere thanks and appreciation.

This motion was approved by a rising vote.

President James K. Pollock at this point delivered the gavel to President-Elect Odegard, who gave a brief response and adjourned the 1950 business meeting at 6:05 P.M.—HARVEY WALKER, *Secretary-Treasurer.*

Problems of legal documentation were the principal concern of the meeting in Paris on December 28–30, 1950, of the Executive Bureau of the International Committee for Comparative Law. The United States was represented by William S. Barnes, director of foreign law research in the Harvard Law School and member of the Executive Bureau's subcommittee on documentation. Two projects were agreed upon, one for 1951 and the other for the next five years.

The 1951 project calls for the cataloguing of sources of information on the law in the principal areas of the world, including both the listing of periodicals and serial publications with information on their character, size, cost and editors, and the listing of centers of legal activity and law libraries. The five-year project calls for encouragement of (a) bibliographies of legal literature basic to an understanding of each jurisdiction or system of law, together with yearly supplements; (b) a basic introduction to the law of one or two countries to serve as a pattern for others; (c) a yearbook on the law of one of the countries already introduced; (d) a plan for uniform indices and format susceptible of translation and compilation eventually as a looseleaf yearbook of the law of the world; and (e) the formation of centers of documentation in each country with a clearing house among them.

The organization of a report on the teaching of law was the second task before the Bureau. It is to be coordinated with UNESCO's project for the other social sciences (sociology, anthropology, economics and political science) in eight countries (USA, United Kingdom, India, France, Sweden, Poland, Mexico and Egypt). Stress is to be laid on the role of law in the educational system. Professor J. P. Niboyet (France) was chosen as the general *rapporteur* for the eight countries. The American Foreign Law Association will head the effort in the United States. At its meeting of January 4, 1951, the American Foreign Law Association elected Alexis C. Coudert as its representative on the Executive Bureau for the next term. He is director of the Parker School of Foreign and Comparative Law in Columbia University and a member of the law firm of Coudert Brothers.

The International Union of Local Authorities will hold its 1951 congress in Brighton, England, June 25–30. The chief topic on the agenda will be "Local Authorities and Education." The congress will consider specifically the administrative aspects of education in the countries of member organizations of the International Union and will attempt to clarify the role of local government in the field of education. A second topic to be considered will be "Water Supply and Sewerage." Persons interested in the congress may obtain additional information from N. Arkema, general secretary of the International Union, 5 Paleisstraat, The Hague, Netherlands.

The Chicago area members of the American Political Science Association met at Northwestern University on November 17, 1950. The program for this meeting was a panel discussion on the subject: "Organization for Governmental Regulation of Labor Relations." Participants were William W. Wirtz, professor of law at Northwestern University, Edwin E. Witte, chairman of the department of economics of the University of Wisconsin, Avery Leiserson of the department of political science of the University of Chicago, and Rollin B. Posey, chairman of the department of political science of Northwestern University.

The fourth annual meeting of the Western Political Science Association was held at Idaho State College, Pocatello, Idaho, November 24–25, 1950. The program for the meeting included nine round tables, which focused attention on both domestic and foreign problems. Separate round tables gave attention to the war in East Asia, the role of the organization of the American states in the defense of western democracy, public power policies in western states, and the present-day status of civil liberties. Among the additional features of the program was an address by Claudius O. Johnson of Washington State College on the topic, "Civil Liberties: The Citizens' Unfinished Business." The Association decided to hold its fifth annual meeting at San Francisco, California, in conjunction with the forty-seventh annual meeting of the American Political Science Association. Officers of the Western Political Science Association for 1951 include: Samuel C. May of the University of California (Berkeley), president; Leo C. Riethmayer of the University of Colorado, vice-president; and F. B. Shick of the University of Utah, secretary-treasurer.

The nineteenth annual meeting of the Southern Political Science Association was held at Durham and Chapel Hill, North Carolina, November 16–18, 1950. The program for the meeting was devoted principally to southern government and politics, although attention was given to subjects of more general interest in some of the addresses and round table discussions. "An Obituary of a Political Scientist" was the subject of the presidential address, by Jasper B. Shannon of the University of Kentucky. President James K. Pollock of the American Political Science Association, who represented this Association at the meeting, delivered an address on "The First Year of the Bonn Government." Others to address the meeting were Jonathan Daniels, editor of the Raleigh *News and Observer*, and Paul Appleby, dean of the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs of Syracuse University. The latter spoke on hostility to government at a luncheon for the Southern Political Science Association and southern members of the American Society for Public Administration. The Southern Political Science Association will hold its next annual meeting at Chattanooga, Tennessee. Its newly elected officers include: Taylor Cole of Duke University, president; Lynwood M. Holland of Emory University, vice-president; and Henry N. Williams of Vanderbilt University, recording secretary.

Regional meetings of political scientists to be held in the spring of 1951 include the annual meeting of the Pacific Northwest Political Science Association to be held in April at Eugene, Oregon, the annual meeting of the Midwest Conference of Political Scientists to be held May 4–6 at the University of Minnesota, and the annual meeting of the New England Political Science Association to be held at Williams College.

The twenty-seventh session of the Institute of World Affairs was held at Riverside, California, December 10–13, 1950. The occasion marked the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Institute under the chancellorship of Rufus B. von KleinSmid, chancellor of the University of Southern California. The director of the 1950 session was J. William Robinson, professor of international relations at Whittier College. Within the general theme of world leadership in mid-century, addresses, round tables and discussions were held on various aspects of the topics, "America and World Leadership," "World Viewpoints toward American Leadership," and "American Leadership and International Organization." Among the participants were Robert A. Millikan of the California Institute of Technology; Albert C. Jacobs, chancellor of the University of Denver; Clyde Eagleton of New York University; Hans J. Morgenthau of the University of

Chicago; Clark Eichelberger of the American Association for the United Nations; and Edgar E. Robinson of Stanford University. Twenty colleges and universities, as well as several professional groups and government officials, cooperated in presenting the Institute's program.

The seventh annual Public Affairs Conference, sponsored by the department of history and political science at the State College of Washington, was held in Spokane, Washington, on October 14, 1950, with a registration of approximately 200 persons from the Pacific Northwest area. The theme of this Conference was "Better Living Through Community Planning." Panel discussions focused attention on the administrative, fiscal and personnel problems of the planning agency, traffic and parking problems, planning for the metropolitan community and planning for the smaller community. Featured speakers at the general sessions were Charles McKinley, professor of political science at Reed College and long-time member of the planning commission of Portland, Oregon, and Charles B. Bennett, director of planning for the City of Los Angeles. The director of the Conference was Paul Beckett, associate professor of public administration at the State College of Washington.

OTHER ACTIVITIES

On January 29, 1951, the President of the United States requested the director of the Bureau of the Budget to establish a federal history program for the agencies engaged in emergency defense activities. The program is to be under the active direction of the Bureau of the Budget, although the studies to be undertaken under the program are to be conducted by the individual agencies. It is expected that the studies will be of assistance in orienting new officials and in enabling all officials to obtain a broader understanding of agency problems and policies. It is not intended that they include a detailed review of the accomplishments of the several agencies, but rather that they constitute objective analyses of problems confronted and how the problems are met.

This program is to be similar to the federal history program conducted during World War II. The latter resulted in a series of studies which are being used in the current mobilization effort, especially in the fields of military procurement, economic stabilization, and expansion of the armed forces. James W. Fesler of the University of North Carolina, who served as War Production Board historian during World War II, has been consultant to the Bureau of the Budget during the planning for the program which is now being inaugurated.

The University of Chicago has announced the establishment of a center for the study of American foreign policy, which has been made possible by a grant from the Lilly Endowment, Inc., an educational trust. The director of the center is Hans J. Morgenthau, professor of political science at the University of Chicago. His staff includes a historian, a political scientist and two research assistants.

Princeton University recently received a gift of $500,000 from the Milbank

Memorial Fund to establish a professorship to be known as the Albert G. Milbank Professorship of International Law and Practice. Income from the gift will be used to pay the salary of the professor who holds the chair and to defray incidental expenses, including the costs of travel and research. The professorship will be in the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, which was founded at Princeton in 1930 with Mr. Milbank as one of its major supporters.

Stanford University and the Tokyo National University sponsored an American studies program in Japan in the summer of 1950, the program being financed in part by a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation. Participants included James T. Watkins, IV, of the department of political science of Stanford University, as well as four members of other academic departments at Stanford. At the end of the summer nine Japanese participants in the studies program were brought to America under the National Leaders program of the Supreme Command of the Allied Powers. This group included three Japanese professors of political science: Makoto Saito, recently elected to the Hepburn chair of American political history at Tokyo National University; Norio Ogata of Hokkaido National University; and Takeshi Haruki of Aoyama Gakuin, Tokyo.

The United States Army sponsored an intensive course in American parties and election procedures for the chairman and several other members of the National Election Administration Commission of Japan during October and November, 1950. The course was planned by Hugh A. Bone, professor of political science at the University of Washington, who also gave the course. Political scientists in New York City, at Western Reserve University and at the University of Illinois, assisted in providing field work in their respective locations.

The Institute of International Education recently sponsored a three-week study program in Federal personnel administration for the chairman and five other members of the National Personnel Authority of Japan. The program was arranged by Catheryn Seckler-Hudson, chairman of the department of political science and public administration of the American University, and Washington consultant for the Japanese delegation. Participants included fifty-five government officials of the United States, as well as all members of the department of political science and public administration of the American University.

At the annual inter-institutional meeting of the Washington Semester Colleges at the American University, the following institutions were admitted to the Washington Semester program: Millsaps College, Kenyon College, William Jewell College, Willamette University, and Beloit College. Institutions already participating in the cooperative arrangement for special honors study of national government in action are: Hamline University, Denison University, the College of Wooster, Lindenwood College, Birmingham-Southern College, Westminster College, Dickinson College, Allegheny College, and Transylvania College.

Roosevelt College and its department of political science sponsored a series of public lectures on the general topic, "Government and the General Welfare," from September 28 to October 26, 1950. The series included the following lectures: "The TVA—A National Asset," by Gordon R. Clapp, chairman of the Board, Tennessee Valley Authority; "The Defense Establishment," by Colonel David M. Fowler, Office of Chief of Information, Department of the Army; "Housing," by John Sparkman, United States Senator from Alabama; "Civil Service," by Frances Perkins, United States civil service commissioner; "Atomic Energy," by Joseph Volpe, Jr., general counsel, United States Atomic Energy Commission; and "Unsettled and Unbalanced Populations," by Ugo Carusi, chairman, Displaced Persons Commission.

Leonard D. White delivered a series of public lectures under the auspices of the Walgreen Foundation during the autumn quarter at the University of Chicago. The lectures, titled "Three Jeffersonians," were based on his study of public administration during the Jeffersonian period.

James Reston, diplomatic correspondent of the New York *Times*, delivered the Remsen D. Bird lectures in political science at Occidental College in October, 1950.

Werner Levi, now on sabbatical leave from the University of Minnesota, recently delivered a series of five lectures on the Marshall Plan at Delhi University, India.

R. John Tresolini, assistant professor of political science at Lehigh University, delivered a series of lectures on American government and international relations at the Armed Forces Information School during the summer of 1950.

The Policy Sciences Foundation, 127 Wall Street, New Haven, Connecticut, announces its first annual essay competition on the topic: "A Study in American Policy Formation and Execution." A competitor may choose a single instance of domestic or foreign, local or state policy; or he may choose a series of related policies. Competition is open to undergradutaes in American colleges and universities, including those who graduate in 1951. There is no limit on the length of essays, although it is recommended that they not exceed 10,000 words. Manuscripts should be prepared in duplicate and addressed to The Essay Competition, Policy Sciences Foundation, 127 Wall Street, New Haven, Connecticut. April 15, 1951, is the closing date for the receipt of essays, and winning essays are to be announced June 1, 1951. The first prize is $200, the second prize $100, and five prizes of $50 each are to be given to third place winners.

The *Institut für Politische Wissenschaft*, recently created in Germany following a generous grant for the purpose from the United States high commissioner, has now completed its organization and is engaged in an analysis of the recent German elections. Its scientific advisory council consists of Professors Alfred Weber (Heidelberg), Robert Redslob (Strassbourg), T. H. Marshall (London), and Franz Neumann (Columbia University, New York). The research director is O. H. v. d. Gablentz. American political scientists who are interested in the work of the *Institut* may secure further information regarding its activities by writing to Professor Neumann or by addressing the *Institut* directly. The address of the *Institut* is: Gelfertstrasse 11, Berlin-Dahlem.

The publication of the *Revue d'Histoire Politique et Constitutionnelle* is being resumed in Paris, pursuant to a decision of the International Academy of Political Science and Constitutional History at its meeting at the Sorbonne in 1949. The *Revue,* the official organ of the Academy, was suspended in 1940 by the occupation authorities. Its editors are Julliot de la Morandière, dean of the Faculty of Law of the University of Paris, and Boris Mirkine-Guetzévitch, dean of the Faculty of Law and Political Science of the French University of New York.

Pending possible arrangements for the publication of an international political science review, UNESCO has agreed to reserve space in each issue of its *International Social Science Bulletin* for contributions from members of the International Political Science Association. The executive secretary of the Association has asked the undersigned to serve as editorial adviser for contributions from American and Canadian political scientists.

In addition to news items of international interest, a limited number of original articles will be considered for publication. Such articles, ranging in length from 3,000 to 5,000 words, should be appropriate for an international audience. Topics regarded as particularly suitable for this purpose include significant developments in teaching technique, curricular organization, research methodology, general political theory, and the study of comparative political institutions and behavior. A modest honorarium will be paid to authors of original articles accepted for publication. The UNESCO *Bulletin,* now issued in separate English and French editions, reaches several thousand social scientists throughout the free world.

American political scientists desiring to submit contributions should send them to the undersigned at the following address: Department of Government, City College of New York, Convent Avenue and 139th Street, New York 31, N. Y.—WALTER R. SHARP.

APPOINTMENTS AND STAFF CHANGES

Orville Alexander has been named chairman of the department of government at Southern Illinois University.

Andrew Anderson, a graduate in law at Cornell University, has been appointed as an instructor in the department of government and international relations at the University of Connecticut.

W. K. Braun is an instructor in political science at the University of Cincinnati for the academic year 1950–51.

Burton R. Brazil has been appointed acting instructor in political science at Stanford University.

Ralph J. Bunche has been appointed professor of government at Harvard University, effective 1951.

Edgar C. Cale is on leave from the University of Pennsylvania for the academic year 1950–51 and is serving as director of public relations for the Philadelphia City Charter Commission.

Gwendolen M. Carter, associate professor of government at Smith College, has been named chairman of the department of government at that institution.

J. Leo Cefkin is an instructor in the department of political science at Brooklyn College for the academic year 1950–51.

James Dalton, instructor in political science at the University of Cincinnati during 1949–50, is studying at the University of the Philippines under a Fulbright grant.

Howard E. Dean, assistant professor of political science at the University of Oregon, was recalled to active duty as an officer in the Army of the United States, effective January 2, 1951.

Francis Downing has been appointed as an assistant professor of political science at Brooklyn College.

Lawrence L. Durisch, chief of the Government Research Division, Tennessee Valley Authority, was visiting professor in the department of political science of the University of Illinois during the first semester of 1950–51.

Harold L. Enarson is on leave from Stanford University and is continuing work which he began in the summer of 1950 as assistant to John R. Steelman, presidential assistant.

Ludwig F. Freund, chairman of the department of political science of Roosevelt College, is a guest professor of political science at the University of Erlangen, Germany, for the second half of the winter semester of 1950–51 and the summer semester of 1951.

Richard W. Gable is acting assistant professor of political science at Stanford University during the absence of Professor Harold L. Enarson.

Clarence O. Gardner has retired from active service at the University of Cincinnati, where he has been since 1914. He has been named professor emeritus of political science.

Louis Gerson, formerly of the Yale Graduate School, has been appointed as an instructor in the department of government and international relations of the University of Connecticut.

Harold D. Gordon, recently a graduate student at Duke University, has been appointed instructor in political science at Wheaton College.

Alex Gottfried has been appointed to an assistant professorship at the University of Washington.

John H. Hallowell was advanced to a full professorship in political science at Duke University in September, 1950.

Ferrel Heady has been appointed assistant director of the Institute of Public Administration at the University of Michigan.

Richard H. Heindel, formerly with the Social Science Research Council as executive associate, has been appointed deputy director of the UNESCO Relations Staff, United States Department of State.

J. C. Heinlein has been advanced to the rank of associate professor of political science at the University of Cincinnati.

Vincent Hogan has been advanced from a lecturership to an instructorship at the University of Washington.

Harry Kantor, formerly lecturer at the University of California (Los Angeles), has been appointed as an instructor in political science at Eastern Washington College of Education, Cheney, Washington.

Kazuo Kawai, formerly editor of the *Nippon Times*, Tokyo, Japan, is visiting professor of political-science at Stanford University.

Willmoore Kendall is on leave from Yale University to serve with the Office of Operations Research, Washington, D. C.

V. O. Key, Jr., has been appointed professor of government at Harvard University, effective 1951.

Samuel J. Konefsky is on sabbatical leave from Brooklyn College for the academic year 1950–51 and is engaged in study as a Guggenheim fellow.

John W. Lederle has been promoted to a professorship and named director of the Institute of Public Administration at the University of Michigan.

Karl Loewenstein of Amherst College spent most of the spring and summer of 1950 in Europe on a field investigation of European union. He also served during the summer on a grant from the United States Department of State as a consultant in governmental affairs to the United States high commissioner for Germany.

S. Gale Lowrie has resumed his work at the University of Cincinnati after spending a year in New Zealand and Honolulu under a Fulbright grant.

George E. McReynolds, head of the department of government and international relations at the University of Connecticut, has been named dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at that University.

John H. Millett has been promoted to an assistant professorship at the University of Rochester.

B. Mirkine-Guetzévitch resumed his duties as dean of the Faculty of Law and Political Science of the French University of New York the past fall, after having taught during the spring semester of 1950 at the National School of Administration and at the Institute of Advanced International Studies of the University of Paris.

Allan S. Nanes has resigned his position in the Division of Research for the Near East and Africa of the United States Department of State to become an instructor in political science at Hofstra College.

William F. Nowlin has been appointed head of a recently created department of Government at Texas State University, Houston, Texas.

Alan Burr Overstreet, formerly of Wesleyan University (Connecticut), is now an associate professor of government at Smith College.

Roy Pierce, formerly of Cornell University, has been appointed as an instructor in the department of government at Smith College.

Mary Reynolds has been appointed as an assistant professor of political science at the University of Bridgeport.

Glenn Roderick, formerly a graduate student at Western Reserve University, became an instructor in the department of government of the University of Miami (Florida) at the beginning of the fall semester of 1950–51.

Joseph S. Roucek, chairman of the department of political science at the University of Bridgeport, will be visiting professor at the University of British Columbia, Vancouver, in the summer of 1951.

Dankwart A. Rustow has been appointed to an associate professorship in the Division of Citizenship of Oglethorpe University.

Gustave Serino has been named director for an intern program in public administration which was recently inaugurated by the department of government of the University of Miami (Florida).

Graham H. Stuart, now on sabbatical leave from Stanford University, is in Europe under a Fulbright grant.

Willis G. Swartz, professor and chairman of the department of government at Southern Illinois University since 1930, has been named dean of the Graduate College of that institution.

Marvin Tableman, instructor at the University of Michigan, has been designated as project coordinator for the German Visitors Governmental Training Project sponsored at the University of Michigan by the United States Department of State.

Robert W. Tucker is acting assistant professor of political science at Stanford University during the absence of Professor Graham H. Stuart.

Erwin Van Allen has been promoted to the rank of associate professor of political science at Bradley University.

E. V. Walter, recently a graduate student at the University of Minnesota, became an instructor in the department of government of the University of Miami (Florida) at the beginning of the second summer session of 1950.

Robert E. Ward has been promoted to an assistant professorship at the University of Michigan.

Glenn G. Wiltsey, chairman of the department of government of the University of Rochester, has been promoted to a full professorship at that institution.

Daniel Wit, formerly instructor of political science at Ohio State University, has joined the political science staff of the University of Cincinnati as assistant professor.

Paul Yloisaker is on leave from Swarthmore College for the second semester of 1950–51 and the first semester of 1951–52 for study in England under a Fulbright scholarship.

William H. Young has resumed full-time teaching at the University of Wisconsin after an extended leave during which he served as assistant to the governor of Wisconsin.

IN MEMORIAM

Irby Roland Hudson, long a member of the political science staff at Vanderbilt University, died on December 2, 1949. Although a veteran of World War I, and one-time editorial writer for the Nashville *Tennessean,* he spent more than half of his life as student and teacher at Vanderbilt. For approximately a quarter of a century he also served as faculty adviser to the Vanderbilt Student Union. He was one of the founders of the Southern Political Science Association, and served this Association as president in 1930. His death occurred after a lingering illness which was endured with a hope to live until he reached sixty-six years of age, a hope that was gratified to the exact day.

John Calyer Ranney, associate professor of government at Smith College, died in London, England, on January 5, 1950, at the age of thirty-four. At the time of his death he was a Guggenheim fellow, and had gone to England to engage in a study of British political parties. The co-author of *The Major Foreign Powers,* published in 1949, he had been a member of the faculty of Smith College for six and a half years, having been appointed assistant professor in 1943. He was active as a member of numerous faculty committees, and was acting head of the department of government during the academic year 1946–47. A memorial fund is being collected at Smith College in his honor.

Earl Willis Crecraft, professor of political science at Kent State University, died on March 30, 1950, at the age of sixty-four. He had served on the faculties of Columbia and New York Universities and the University of Akron, as well as Kent State University. He became dean of the College of Liberal Arts of Kent State University in 1938 and continued in this position until 1947, when he asked to be relieved of administrative duties. While in declining health after 1947, he met his classes regularly, including the day of his death. His published writings include the monograph, *Freedom of the Seas*, which was published in 1935.

Alden Leslie Powell, professor of government at Louisiana State University, died on June 9, 1950, after a cerebral hemorrhage suffered a few days earlier. He was forty-seven years-old and had been at Louisiana State University for fifteen years, during which time he served as assistant to the dean of the College of Arts and Sciences (1941 to 1944) and as acting head of the department of government (1950). He was long an active member of the Southern Political Science Association, and served this Association as vice-president in 1939 and as a member of the Executive Council from 1948 to 1950.

Edmund Grant Howe of Marietta College died in Tuscaloosa, Alabama, on August 20, 1950, at sixty-six years of age. His death brought to a close a long career of teaching, for which he had been prepared by studies at both European and American universities. Beginning his teaching career in 1910, as instructor at Marietta Academy, he later served on the faculties of the University of Pittsburgh, the University of Alabama and Marietta College. He served as head of the department of political science of the University of Alabama from the time the department was organized in 1921 until 1938. In 1938 he became head of the department of political science of Marietta College, and he continued in this position until the date of his death.

Wilbur Wallace White, M. D. Anderson professor of political science at Rice Institute, died following a heart attack on November 14, 1950, at forty-seven years of age. Beginning his teaching career as instructor at Assuit College, Assuit, Egypt, he served in various capacities as teacher and administrator in colleges and universities in the United States. He was dean of the Graduate School of Western Reserve University from 1941 to 1948, and was president of the University of Toledo from 1948 to 1950. He resigned from the presidency of the University of Toledo in April, 1950, and hoped to return to teaching in political science. His death came just two and a half months after he had joined the faculty at Rice Institute.

BOOK REVIEWS, NOTES, NOTICES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

WESTERN EUROPEAN COMMUNISM: A PROFILE

I. INTRODUCTION

Communism, as a phenomenon of Western society, flourishes only in France and Italy. In other European countries, either Communism is so weak that it has failed to produce or to influence and inspire an important body of literature, or it is the core of a Communist dictatorship which can properly be studied only as part of a discussion of Soviet Communism itself. But in France and Italy are to be found Communist Parties operating freely within a Western democratic parliamentary framework and enjoying the support of 30 per cent of the population. In these two countries they have today reached the peak of their power since their nearly simultaneous founding thirty years ago. Here Communism is one of the strongest political parties; here it is responsible for a body of writings which testifies to its far-reaching efforts to conquer the minds of the nearly one hundred million people of the area.

With few exceptions, the materials analyzed in these pages have been published between 1947 and 1950. The choice of 1947 as the year *a quo* is based, of course, upon the fact that it was then that tripartite governments came to an end, almost at the same time, in France and Italy. Until then, Communist attitudes were to some extent based upon the belief that the party had become a permanent element of the structure of government; but since 1947, as the chief opposition group, the Communist Party has revealed more openly its essential characteristics. On the other hand, 1951 will very likely open a new period in the history of the French and Italian Communist Parties. Apart from the fact that at the end of 1950 the leaders of the two Parties, Thorez and Togliatti, were both recuperating in Moscow from serious illnesses, important signs are visible that the two Parties are now under heavy pressure from Soviet Communism to revise their tactics in a "militant" way. Recently the official Italian Communist Party daily, *l'Unità,* has been sharply criticized by the Cominform organ because "it does not adequately reflect the activities of the local Peace Committees or the work of the mass democratic organizations fighting for peace, devotes still little attention to the position of small landowners and to the defense of their interests. Frequently, it shows an insufficiently critical approach in using information and reports circulated by the bourgeois news agencies on various questions of international life. There are instances when, dealing with questions of culture and art, the newspaper does not adhere to a consistent Marxist-Leninist viewpoint; it does not devote sufficient attention to ideological work among the progressive intelligentsia and, as yet, makes insufficient use of correspondence drawn from its readers, particularly workers and peasants."[1] In France, the top Party hierarchy itself has just been the object of the kind of humiliating reproach that appears more suitable when addressed to a college Marxist discussion group than to such veterans as a Duclos or a Marty. The Central Committee of the French Communist Party was forced, on October 20, 1950, to admit (1) that it was ideologically ignorant; (2) that its work was of poor quality; (3) that its organization and efforts were lax and inadequate.[2] It is certain that the Party is now in hands determined to harden its structure and activities, in keeping with its future tasks in case of open war in Europe. A new leadership is coming to the front everywhere as the second phase of the post-liberation period comes to an end and as the battle against the inroads of Titoism increases in intensity.

---

[1] "Vital Tasks of the Communist Press," in *For A Lasting Peace, For A People's Democracy!* (Bucharest. December 8, 1950.) The praise by which this criticism was

II. HISTORICAL WRITING

The very novelty of large-scale Western European Communism explains the paucity of historical works dealing with it, even if we ignore the peculiar difficulties of writing about a movement whose development is hard to follow and whose hermetic language baffles the interpreter. Work now under way on the development of Communism from 1919 to 1950 may fill some of the existing gaps. Both Communists and non-Communists are engaged in this task, though to the present most published work has come from non-Communist sources.

The French Communist Party is the subject of the three volumes by Ceyrat, Walter and Rossi.[3] Ceyrat wants to show that every action of the Party from

---

prefaced did not in any way diminish the significance of the attack aiming at the elimination of the "bourgeois" tendencies of Togliatti.

[2] The developments leading to the climax of October 20 are still shrouded in the mystery we have come to expect, but, as far as can be ascertained, this is the chronology of events. The Central Committee of the French Communist Party met in Paris in September 29, 1950, to hear a report by the Secretary-General, Maurice Thorez. The report was published in full in *l'Humanité* of September 30, 1950. The publication of the October, 1950, issue of the *Cahiers du Communisme*, the official organ of the Central Committee of the Party, was delayed for a few days to enable it to publish the text of the resolutions voted as a result of the September 29 meeting. The defense of peace and of the United Front appear as their main themes. On October 10, Thorez suffered the stroke from which he is now recovering in Moscow. Auguste Lecoeur, who appears to have taken over the leadership of the Party, called the Central Committee to meet in Saint-Ouen on October 20. At that time, Lecoeur delivered an address (see full text in *Cahiers du Communisme*, December, 1950, pp. 47–60) in which remarks alleged to have been made by Thorez at the September 29 meeting, but not before mentioned anywhere, served as the basis for the presentation by Lecoeur of the following resolution: "The members of the Central Committee of the French Communist Party, . . . conscious of their responsibilities, engage themselves: (1) to strengthen their ideological education by devoting regularly the necessary amount of time to the study of Marxist-Leninist classics as well as of all essential party documents and documents of the Cominform and other mass organizations, and to prepare carefully the meetings of their study group; (2) to improve the quality of their work, and to organize each meeting of the Central Committee in such a way as to bring the most constructive elements to the discussion and formulation of the political line; (3) to double their efforts to clarify political problems, and to control carefully and rigorously the total execution by those concerned of the decisions reached, since the political line must not simply be proclaimed but must be executed."

[3] *La Trahison Permanente: Parti Communiste et Politique Russe.* By Maurice Ceyrat.

1919 to 1947 was determined by Russia in complete disregard of French interests. Walter's history covers the period from 1919 to 1940. It is a careful and detailed piece of writing undertaken by an outsider. Walter does not convey the meaning of the changes in Communist Party attitude during August and September, 1939, and, unlike Ceyrat, he does not refer to any of the documents dealing with Communist-Nazi collaboration in France during the summer and fall of 1940. But for the period up to World War II, this is the best documented and most satisfactory description we possess of the Communist Party's structure and activities.

Rossi's book is a far more penetrating study of Communism undertaken by one who was an important Communist leader from 1919 to 1929. Angelo Tasca (for this is the author's name) has been for a long time a perceptive student of revolutionary movements. To him we owe one of the best studies of the rise of Italian Fascism. He was one of the founders of the Italian Communist Party early in 1921. He then saw Communism chiefly as the assertion of the right of the industrial workers to manage in common their own affairs, freed from the double oppression of the state and of capitalism. His break with Communism came when he realized that Communism would inevitably subject the workers to a state dictatorship worse than anything that had preceded it. In his book, Rossi seeks to free Marxism, at least in part, from the accusation of being linked to Leninism and Stalinism. He is convinced that Marx's inspiration was deeply humanist, but admits that Marx's basic mistake was his belief that a society of free men could be created by using the dictatorship of the proletariat as an instrument. Rossi is also convinced that Communism as now practiced represents a break in the history of Western thought and that Christian ethics is incompatible with totalitarian Communism—this from the pen of a writer who calls himself a "lay Socialist." Rossi has added to his documentation on Communist collaboration with the Nazis in a more recent book on the Soviet-German alliance.[4]

One of Rossi's fellow Communist workers of thirty years ago who has served as a Party leader to the present has published two interesting, if not literate, volumes of memoirs.[5] The first deals with the Party's history "under Gramsci's leadership," the second with its history "under Togliatti's leadership." The chief value of the work lies in its description of Italian Communist activities

---

(Paris: Spartacus. 1948. Pp. 167.) *Histoire du Parti Communiste Français.* By Gérard Walter. (Paris: Somogy. 1948. Pp. 391.) *Physiologie du Parti Communiste Français.* By A. Rossi. (Paris: Éditions Self. 1948. Pp. xxxvi, 465.) Abridged English translation: *A Communist Party in Action.* By A. Rossi. Translated and edited with an introduction by Willmoore Kendall. (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1949. Pp. xxiv, 301.) Reviewed in the June, 1950, issue of this journal, pp. 470–73.

[4] *Deux Ans d'Alliance Germano-Soviétique. Août 1939–Juin 1941.* By A. Rossi. (Paris: Fayard. 1949. Pp. 225.)

[5] *Ricordi di un Operaio Torinese.* By Mario Montagnana. (Rome: Rinascita. 1949. 2 Vols. Pp. 299, 201.) In the same category can be included *Enfance: Souvenirs d'Enfance et de Jeunesse.* By P. Vaillant-Couturier, with preface by Aragon. (Paris: Editions Hier et Aujourd'hui. 1946. Pp. 250.)

abroad during the Fascist dictatorship, and especially in its discussion of Italian Communist participation in the Spanish Civil War. The memoirs were written in Mexico City in 1943–44 and do not contain any material after that date.

Among the more perplexing phenomena of postwar Europe has been the ease with which the Communists have seized control of trade unions.[6] The two volumes published by the Italian General Confederation of Labor are chiefly important for the full record they contain of the struggle at Confederation meetings and conventions by the non-Communist groups to defend such concepts as "interclassism" and "apolitical syndicalism" from the Communist attacks, and of the pledges by Catholic organizers that Catholic trade unions would never betray the interests of the workers. But we owe to the well-known French syndicalist writer Georges Lefranc a coherent account of the way in which the Communists achieved their victory. Between August, 1944, and April, 1946, the Communists were able to complete the conquest of the C.G.T., a goal which had eluded them twice before, in 1919 and 1936. Lefranc shows how the Socialist trade union leaders were handicapped initially by the absence of Léon Jouhaux and how the Socialists suffered from their uninspiring conduct during the war crisis.

Not all Communist historians have been over-awed by their theme. At least one of them has dealt with the "dearest enemies" in the gently devastating way of a *New Yorker* profile.[7] Gorresio is a "bourgeois" newspaperman who is convinced that many of the older Italian Communists are bourgeois in disguise who are quite unable to shed the cultural heritage received in the universities. He is trying to show that, after all, Togliatti is disillusioned with a life of conspiracy and exile and would enjoy nothing more than a pleasant meal in a Roman *trattoria* and an occasional polemic on the meaning of Guido Cavalcanti's thirteenth century sonnets on love. The difficulty with this hopeful interpretation is that Togliatti is now being re-educated in Moscow, while the effective leadership of the Party has shifted to men quite immune to the blandishments of the *dolce stil nuovo.*

III. WITHIN THE FORTRESS

The Resistance

From the day the French Communists described themselves as "le parti des fusillés," the Communists have sought to identify themselves with the very idea of Resistance. Gabriel Péri, Danielle Casanova, Jacques Decour, Georges Politzer and many others have become the symbols of a new Communism which because of them could identify itself rightfully with the noblest traditions of the nation and with the highest aspirations of mankind. The epic narrator of the deeds of those who died to create *les lendemains qui chantent* is, of course,

---

[6] *Les Expériences Syndicales en France de 1939 à 1950.* By Georges Lefranc. (Paris: Aubier. 1950. Pp. 381.) *La CGIL dal Patto di Roma al Congresso di Genova.* By the Ufficio Stampa e Propaganda della CGIL. (Rome: CGIL. 1949. Vol. I. Pp. 286. Vol. III. Pp. 397.) Four more volumes are to follow shortly. The entire series will cover the years 1944–1949.

[7] *I Carissimi Nemici.* By Vittorio Gorresio. (Milan: Longanesi. 1949. Pp. 341.)

Louis Aragon,[8] whose hobby is the collection of books on French medieval literature. As Aragon tells his friends, "When I die, I will bequeath all these books to the library of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, for it is easy to see that, while Marxist classics and traditional French classics will always be there, someone is needed to collect medieval literature." The common theme of Aragon's book-collecting and of his singing the deeds of the French Resistance is chivalry: "Aragon admires and studies the early French writers because . . . they are the poets of one of the noblest efforts ever accomplished by men to perfect themselves and the society in which they live."[9] To a less sensitive reader, the first four volumes of Aragon's monumental *chanson* (when complete it will probably run to fifteen volumes) appear as a monotonous and rather boring chronicle of the "phony" war. Amidst the general depravity and corruption of the ruling classes and of the bourgeoisie, the simple nobility of the Communists stands out. Maurice Thorez shakes the hand of Armand Barbantane; and when Armand asks his leader for directives, the answer comes: "Nothing in particular. Be the best everywhere, do what your conscience as a Communist and as a Frenchman tells you to do." Elsewhere,[10] Aragon had implied that the new Communist man would develop fully only in time of crisis. Then all that is noble, disinterested, pure and heroic in man comes to the fore. Then Communist man cannot be considered apart from the other members of the community; he becomes the nation's symbol.

Luigi Longo's account of the Italian underground[11] is on a quite different level. The new boss of Italian Communism has sought to follow patterns in military historical writing which present a factual account of military operations in wartime. The book contains maps, photographs, statistics, indices, bibliography and is very detailed. Longo includes in his account the activities of non-Communist partisan groups, to strengthen his claim to the title of historian of the Resistance.

The Leaders

Only three men in the French-Italian Communist world occupy the position that is officially pre-empted in the Soviet Union by Lenin and Stalin. They are, for Italy, Antonio Gramsci and Palmiro Togliatti, and, for France, Maurice Thorez. They are the leaders, or at least have been the leaders until the end of 1950, and around them has grown the mythology which is part of all totalitarian movements. Their words on any matter of controversy are quoted with finality. Their works have, therefore, been collected, published and distributed with care and in great numbers, even though their total circulation cannot approach that of Stalin's *History of the Communist Party (B) of the U.S.S.R.*

---

[8] *Les Communistes.* By Louis Aragon. (Paris: La Bibliothèque Française. Vol. I: Février-Septembre 1939. 1949. Pp. 265. Vol. II: Septembre-Novembre 1939. 1949. Pp. 364. Vol. III: Novembre 1939–Mars 1940. 1950. Pp. 413. Vol. IV: Mars–Mai 1940. 1950. Pp. 335.)

[9] Claude Roy, "Les Communistes d'Aragon," *Cahiers du Communisme,* December, 1950, p. 114.

[10] *L'Homme Communiste.* By Louis Aragon. (Paris: Gallimard [NRF]. 1946. Pp. 246.) This is an earlier collection mostly of war-time writings giving an account of some of the more significant exploits of the Resistance.

[11] *Un Popolo alla Macchia.* By Luigi Longo. (Milan: Mondadori. 1947. Pp. 501.)

Gramsci died in prison in 1937, one of the many victims of Fascism. His life, simple and untouched by any direct contact with the problems of political power, his intellectual keenness and his appealing human qualities have all contributed to create a sympathy and respect for the man and writer which are felt by many non-Communists. Benedetto Croce says that his writings belong "also to those who are in the opposite political camp, because of the reverence and affection felt for all those who have kept high the dignity of man." The older Communists have used these elements in seeking to establish Gramsci as the key figure in the renovation of Italian culture, while some younger recruits have tried to find in him verification of their belief that Western Communism was an attempt to end the "alienation" of man and to create permanent conditions of social freedom and was not at all bound to follow upon the constrictive path of Soviet statism.

The five volumes of Gramsci's works now available are material for a well-founded judgment on the issue.[12] The published work is a selection and rearrangement of materials contained in about thirty notebooks written by Gramsci during his ten-year imprisonment and taken to Moscow at his death. They are now being brought out by an anonymous editorial board, which has admitted that passages dealing with family matters have been omitted. What standards were applied to the definition of family matters is not stated and, until this and other clarifications are forthcoming, the present edition of Gramsci's works must be taken as an official Communist Party version. One further limiting factor must be noted. There were not many books available to Gramsci in jail, and his memory, though extraordinary, is not always accurate. Many of his errors and some of his unbalanced judgments are presumably to be attributed to physical circumstances.

It soon becomes clear that, even though Gramsci is constantly engaged in a dialogue with Croce, Lenin and not Croce is his guide. The efforts to "idealize" Gramsci's position collapse; Gramsci is indeed a very good dialectical materialist. The *Risorgimento* is seen by Gramsci as one of several phases of the royal conquest of Italy. His interest in Machiavelli is due to his identification of the prince with the party, the party being further identified with the Communist Party. Gramsci uses an unexpected number of the subtle distinctions which have characterized much of recent Communist writing, such as the one between democratic centralism as practiced by Communist states, which is therefore progressive, and bureaucratic centralism as practiced by bourgeois states, which is therefore reactionary. His justification of dictatorship as an essential instrument of revolution leads one to doubt whether a change occurred in Gramsci between 1919 and 1935; there is no trace of the earlier defense of the workers' factory councils as the autonomous and spontaneous nuclei of a new society. All in all, Gramsci merely exhibited a greater willingness to engage in a polemical debate with the representatives of the culture in which he was born and reared, as well as a greater awareness of what that culture meant for his generation, than has been evidenced by his successors. In addition, he possessed an awareness of the tragedy and of the change in the modern world not seen exclusively from the angle of the Soviet Union. But of the ultimate direction of his thought there can be no doubt, and he rightly belongs in the galaxy of orthodox Communist leaders of the twentieth century.

---

[12] *Opere di Antonio Gramsci.* (Turin: Einaudi.) Vol. I: *Lettere dal Carcere.* (1947. Pp. 260.) Vol. II: *Il Materialismo Storico e la Filosofia di Benedetto Croce.* (1948. Pp. xxiii, 299.) Vol. III: *Gli Intellettuali e l'Organizzazione della Cultura.* (1949. Pp. xv, 208.) Vol. IV: *Il Risorgimento.* (1949. Pp. xiv, 235.) Vol. V: *Note sul Machiavelli, sulla Politica e sullo Stato Moderno.* (1949. Pp. 371.) A collection of letters addressed to his children while Gramsci was in prison was published separately: *L'Albero del Riccio.* (Milan: Milano-Sera Editrice. 1948. Pp. 227.) On Gramsci, see: *Gramsci.* (Rome: Edizioni Rinascita. 1948. Pp. 211.) This volume includes, among others, essays by Palmiro Togliatti, Celeste Negarville, Felice Platone, and Ruggero Grieco. See also *Dal Diario di un Borghese.* By Ranuccio Bianchi Bandinelli. (Milan: Mondadori. 1948. Pp. 259.)

Togliatti's writings are important for a study of the ways of a leading Communist politician when his plan is the conquest of an old Western European country.[13] The Communists, he insists, are reasonable and tolerant people engaged today in Italy in a battle against clerical obscurantism and reaction very much in the manner of the forerunners and champions of bourgeois liberalism in the course of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Togliatti has written a preface to Voltaire's treatise on tolerance[14] in which the method of eighteenth century rationalists is defended against the accusations of abstraction and anti-historicism. While he hastened to recognize the great difference between the Enlightenment and Marxism and insisted that Marxism was a wholly new doctrine, he added that the philosophers of Illuminism must be considered as the anticipators of Communism because of their faith in the power of man and of their efforts to open the path to the renovation of society. But this preface on tolerance cannot conceal the intolerance or the cynicism of Togliatti's position as shown by the main body of his published writings. His position can be summed up by two brief quotations. The first is from a speech delivered on August 11, 1944, at a time when Italian Communism was striving to appear as the leader of a vast national movement of democratic union: "We cannot any longer be a small and narrow association of propagandizers of Communist and Marxist ideals." The second is from a speech delivered on November 7, 1948, at a time when developments involving Czechoslovakia, the elections in Italy and the Marshall Plan left no doubt as to the true position of Communism: "Let us advance with the great Soviet army under the banner of our great chiefs, Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin."

---

[13] Seven volumes of Palmiro Togliatti's writings can be listed here: *Per la Salvezza del Nostro Paese.* (Turin: Einaudi. 1946. Pp. 423.) Important for the texts of Togliatti's Radio Moscow broadcasts between June 27, 1941, and May 7, 1943. Togliatti's indignation against Fascist aggression begins with the attack against the Soviet Union. His list of heroes and models for Italian patriots ranges from Petrarch to Mazzini and Garibaldi; it never once includes the foreign sounding names of Marx and Stalin. *Politica Comunista.* (Rome: Società Editrice l'Unità. 1945. Pp. 352.) Includes the speeches from April, 1944, to August, 1945. *Rinnovare l'Italia.* (Rome: Società Editrice l'Unità. 1946. Pp. 119.) *Tre Minacce alla Democrazia Italiana.* (Rome: Edizioni Rinascita. 1948. Pp. 243.) Reports and speeches before the fifth and sixth national Party Congresses of 1946 and 1948. *Linea d'Una Politica.* (Milan: Milano-Sera Editrice. 1949. Pp. 170.) Mostly parliamentary speeches up to the summer of 1948. *Pace o Guerra.* (Milan: Milano-Sera Editrice. 1949. Pp. 144.) Articles and speeches of 1948 and 1949 geared to the current Communist theme of the defense of peace. *Discorso su Giolitti.* (Rome: Rinascita. 1950. Pp. 108.) An interesting example of Communist interest in the recent revival of Giolitti.

[14] *Trattato sulla Tolleranza.* By Voltaire. With an introduction by Palmiro Togliatti. (Rome: Universale Economica. 1949.)

The French Communist Party has rendered homage to its stricken leader by publishing in October, 1950, the first volume of a new edition of the works of Maurice Thorez.[15] But most of the writings of Thorez have been in print for a long time. One can divide his published writings into three groups: his autobiography,[16] his reports to party congresses,[17] and his appeals for unity.[18] The appeals are addressed to all democrats, Socialists and Catholics and cover the period from the Popular Front days to 1949, when, on April 10, Thorez offered this resolution as binding upon all party members: "We must firmly enforce, with regard to Catholic workers, the policy of the outstretched hand. . . . We must separate the Socialist workers from their leaders and patiently convince them in such a way as to create the conditions for unity of action." Among the appeals we find the moving 1937 passage on the middle ages: "Is it possible to evoke without emotion the centuries which have seen rising towards heaven the spires of our magnificent cathedrals, these pure jewels of popular art, protesting with all the strength of their old stones—very much alive for those who can understand them—against the legend of the dark middle ages?"

Since it follows what has now become a fixed pattern, the Thorez report to the 1950 Congress can be taken as the standard of such Communist documents. As such it deserves a brief summary. The first part, covering about one-fifth of the total length of the document, is devoted to an attack against the United States and Tito as war-mongers. The second part is given over to a rhapsodic account of the progress of peace and democracy in the Soviet Union and of the increasing strength of the peace movement outside of the Soviet Union. The third part looks at France, which is seen on "the edge of the abyss." Only the Communists are defenders of the national interest, only they carry "the memory of our intellectual traditions, of our qualities of taste, of measure, of elegance and probity, all the qualities which have made the greatness of our country." The fourth section appeals once more to the union of all Communists, Socialists and Catholics. The Catholics are told that "rather than quarrel to find out whether there is a paradise in heaven, let us unite so that this world shall no longer be like hell and so that our children will no longer know the horrors of war." The fifth and last section is devoted to the Party itself. Thorez sees some weaknesses within the Party. There is the weakness of opportunism, defined as a failure of the leadership to understand fully the revolutionary potentialities of the workers. There is also sectarianism, denounced a long time ago by Lenin as the infantile sickness of Communism. The true Communist must see his duty to work with the masses and to create the union of all the the working people.

---

[15] *Oeuvres de Maurice Thorez.* (Paris: Éditions Sociales. Vol. I: Janvier 1930–Juin 1931. 1950. Pp. 230. Vol. II: Juin 1931–Février 1932. 1950. Pp. 238.)

[16] *Fils du Peuple.* (Paris: Éditions Sociales. 1949. Pp. 253.) This is a new edition, brought up to date, of a book which had already appeared before the War.

[17] *Une Politique de Grandeur Française.* (Paris: Éditions Sociales. 1945. Pp. 384.) This volume includes the report to the eighth Party Congress of 1936, the report to the ninth Party Congress of 1937, the report to the May 19, 1939, meeting of the Central Committee of the Party, the report and the final address to the tenth Party Congress of 1945. *Au Service du Peuple de France.* (Paris: Éditions du Parti Communiste Français. 1947. Pp. 89.) This is the report to the eleventh Party Congress of 1947. *La Lutte pour l'Indépendance Nationale et pour la Paix.* (Paris: 1950. Pp. 95.) This is the report to the twelfth Party Congress of 1950.

[18] *Pour l'Union: Communistes et Socialistes.* By Maurice Thorez and Jacques Duclos. (Paris: Éditions Sociales. 1949. Pp. 63.) *Pour l'Union: Communistes et Catholiques.* By Maurice Thorez. (Paris: Éditions Sociales. 1949. Pp. 47.) *Pour l'Union: le Front Français.* By Maurice Thorez. (Paris: Éditions Sociales. 1949. Pp. 93.)

One of the main theoretical contributions of Thorez to Communist doctrine is considered to be his placing of the class theory at the service of the United Front. In a special issue of *La Nouvelle Critique* issued to commemorate the fiftieth birthday of Thorez, Guy Besse writes that "to create a Leninist party is not an end in itself; its purpose must be to give to the working class the instrument which will enable it to carry along in its forward march the totality of the people. This is why Maurice Thorez, while maintaining Leninism as the center of his thoughts, has never for one moment separated the battle for the Party from the battle for the unity of action of the proletariat and of the French nation, rallied around the working class. It is because of this that his contribution constitutes a turning point in the history of our movement."[19]

The Theoreticians

The task of strengthening the native roots of French Communism has been assigned to the young philosopher, Roger Garaudy,[20] who represents in the National Assembly the department which once elected Jean Jaurès. In his endeavor to give as much weight as possible to French Socialism in the formation of Marxist thought, Garaudy undertakes a rehabilitation effort which at times goes perilously beyond Marx and Engels' own evaluation of the significance of French utopian Socialists. For example, Garaudy finds at the core of Fourier's thought "this great idea which Marx and Lenin will make their own, that new material conditions and a new social system free from capitalistic contradictions alone will transform man himself and give him freedom and power in a new land under his dominion." He is hardly closer to orthodoxy in his fulsome praise of eighteenth century materialist philosophers. These men, he writes, have struck at the divine sources of authority, which for them comes rather from experience and utility. They have painted in brilliant colors the progress of technology, of science and of reason. "Materialism, rationalism and optimism are the signs of the youth and strength of this philosophy, which is revolutionary also because, against the myth of the eternal immobility of divine perfection . . . , it has discovered the law of movement. . . . Our materialists have mobilized matter, man and society. Movement has entered the world and will not leave it again." Garaudy again seems to forget that in the official Soviet view, eighteenth century materialism suffers from its static conception of matter. But the concepts of class struggle and class dictatorship are also present in the French Socialist tradition, according to Garaudy, and on these grounds alone the French contribution to scientific Socialism is accepted without challenge.

---

[19] Guy Besse, "Maurice Thorez et Son Apport Théorique au Mouvement Révolutionnaire Français," *La Nouvelle Critique*, May, 1950, pp. 13–33. In another article of the same issue, "Maurice Thorez, Écrivain Public du XXe Siecle," by Maurice Mouillaud (pp. 34–46), Thorez is presented as a writer of a new type. His style is defined as "the style of happiness," because it is the style of the fighting people. "It is because the Communists are the opposite of fatalists that they can write in the style of Maurice Thorez, the style of the French proletariat of our time: optimistic, effective, moving." It is not surprising, according to the author of this essay of literary criticism, to find that this style which mirrors what is best in the French heritage "should also be the one closest to Stalin's style."

[20] *Les Sources Françaises du Socialisme Scientifique.* By Roger Garaudy. (Paris: Éditions Hier et Aujourd'hui. 1948. Pp. 284.) See also his *Grammaire de la Liberté.* (Paris: Editions Sociales. 1950. Pp. 160.)

Hegel has occasioned some concern among French Communist theoreticians. In 1948, Cornu[21] studied the formation of Marxist thought largely in its relation to Hegel and the young Hegelians and said that Marx got from Hegel these essential ideas: first, the conception of the necessary unity between thought and being, a conception which rejects all abstraction and dogmatism and all reasoning on ideas isolated from reality; second, the conception of the dialectical development of history generated by the opposition and contradiction inherent in all living reality. By 1950 any excessive attention to Hegel was officially considered as a form of bourgeois academic "revisionism." Writing in the magazine of French "militant Marxism," the formidable sounding "Commission de Critique du Cercle des Philosophes Communistes"[22] pointed out that Marx and Engels criticized the Hegelian system in order to get at its rational and revolutionary core. In accepting Hegel the contemporary bourgeois philosophers go straight to the reactionary aspects of his thought. For the official philosophers of the party, all that has to be said about Hegel has been said by Marx. They quote with approval Zdhanov's statement that "the question of Hegel has been settled a long time ago," and find the current revival part of the "Fascist revisionism" which characterizes the final crisis of imperialism.

The preoccupations of Georges Cogniot,[23] the deputy from Paris and contributor to *l'Humanité*, are with contemporary issues. More than a third of his book on the "reality of the nation" is an attack on American cosmopolitanism and a description of "hidden America," based upon Senator Sparkman's reports.[24] As practiced by the United States, cosmopolitanism conceals a basic contempt for democracy and the people. When the Communists defend the nation, they are not opposing internationalism. Cogniot praises the Soviet Union and its fight against "objectivism as the principal weapon of the cosmopolitan offensive. . . . Proletarian internationalism rests upon a recognition of the nation and of its sovereign rights, upon the principle of the equality of races and peoples and upon the conviction that capitalism must be eliminated to get rid of all causes of national oppression. Proletarian internationalism and the solidarity and unity of all workers cannot flourish unless all material and spiritual potentialities of each nation are fully developed." This is the thought, too, of Pierre Hervé,[25] who believes that American, English, French and German Communists with a common philosophy and common aspirations have never lost their national characteristics. Confusing neatly the two separate problems of national culture and of surrender of national sovereign rights, Hervé writes that Communists believe in a common destiny of freedom for all peoples but do not think that national cultures can be abandoned in favor of some kind of superior international culture which would be the appanage of a small cosmopolitan élite.

---

[21] *Karl Marx et la Pensée Moderne: Contribution à l'Étude de la Formation du Marxisme.* By Auguste Cornu. (Paris: Éditions Sociales. 1948. Pp. 190.)

[22] "Le Retour à Hegel, Dernier Mot du Révisionnisme Universitaire," *La Nouvelle Critique*, November, 1950, pp. 43–54.

[23] *Réalité de la Nation: l'Attrape-nigaud du Cosmopolitisme.* (Paris: Éditions Sociales.

Along with the defense of the venerable concepts of patriotism and nationalism goes the defense of the family and of womanhood, demoralized and exploited by capitalism. To Thorez' wife, Jeannette Vermeersch, and to Jean Fréville,[26] the aspiration to love in bourgeois societies is a crime which carries in itself its punishment. In a Communist society, "the liberation of woman permits marriage to be founded on love, and to move, as Engels said, from the realm of necessity to the realm of freedom. . . . It is Communism, desiring to give bread and roses to all, which offers love its best chance." But we are also told that it was the success of the Five Year Plans which consolidated the Soviet family. "The progress of industry and the future of the Soviet Union required a more rapid increase of the population. Is not man the essential factor in the construction of Socialism?"

The top position among Communist theoreticians belongs without question to Henri Lefebvre, one of the editors of *La Nouvelle Critique* and a scholar with many important works to his credit.[27] Lefebvre has provided one of the more

---

1950. Pp. 192.) *L'Histoire du Parti Bolchevik et ses Enseignements Actuels.* (Paris: Éditions Sociales. 1949. Pp. 47.)

[24] Cogniot uses the reports on "Low-Income Families and Economic Stability" of the *Joint Committee on the Economic Report.*

[25] Pierre Hervé, "L'Homme Marxiste," in *Les Grands Appels de l'Homme Contemporain*, pp. 79–109. (Paris: Éditions du Temps Présent. 1947. Pp. 237.)

[26] *La Femme et le Communisme: Anthologie des Grands Textes du Marxisme.* Edited, with an introductory essay, by Jean Fréville, and with a preface by Jeannette Vermeersch. (Paris: Éditions Sociales. 1950. Pp. 223.)

[27] Chief among them *Le Matérialisme Dialectique.* (Paris: Alcan. 1939.) In preparation, an eight volume *Traité; du Matérialisme Dialectique.* (Paris: Éditions Sociales.)

forceful answers to the UNESCO questionnaire on democracy. His most important postwar book is a "critique of daily life."[28] He sees Marxism as a many-sided critique of the elements of daily life. It is a critique of the private conscience: Man is a social and human being because of his place within the social context. "*La vie privée*" of individualistic society is indeed "*une vie privée*" of all reality, of all ties with the world, a life deprived of all that is human. "His life disintegrates into contradictory or separate elements: work and rest, public life and personal life . . . the ideal and the real . . . the narrowest, the driest, the most solitary is taken to be the most human." It is a critique of money, which is economic alienation, and of the justification of wealth as a mere accident in the condition of man. Marxism will rehabilitate wealth and use it to achieve the greatness of man and the beauty of life. It is a critique of work, which is the alienation of man. Alienated work loses its social essence; the individual is severed from the social conditions of his activity. It is a critique of the negative concepts of eighteenth century freedoms, which are the freedoms of private individuals and are summed up in the rights of private property. In contrast, the Marxist definition of freedom is concrete and dialectic. Freedom is progressively established through the development of all the power inherent in man; it is the increasing assertion of human controls over nature. Above all, there cannot be individual freedom if the social group to which he belongs is enslaved.

Communism and the Intellectuals

Writings such as Lefebvre's have contributed to the large-scale entry of intellectuals into the ranks of European Communism within the last decade. The Communists have treated the intellectuals with great initial solicitude and tenderness. Thorez himself issued directives to the Party to help the newcomers without any substantial concessions of principle but in a brotherly spirit, so as to eliminate any hesitations that might keep them from Communism. Two chief dangers were to be avoided: on the one hand, that of down-grading the intellectuals and of forcing them into a kind of rough "*ouvrierisme*" which would lead them to despise any colleague who might still be fond of ideas; on the other hand, that of setting up the intellectuals as a separate group within the Party with special privileges but without solidarity or sense of their revolutionary mission.

Laurent Casanova, one of the top "hard" leaders of French Communism, and Emilio Sereni, a "soft" Neapolitan who considers himself "Minister on leave," have been entrusted with the particular care of intellectuals and scientists.[29] But others have assisted these two. Desanti writes of the role of

---

[28] *Critique de la Vie Quotidienne, Introduction.* (Paris: Grasset. 1947. Pp. 248.) A second volume is soon to follow.

[29] *Le Communisme, la Pensée et l'Art.* By Laurent Casanova. (Paris: Éditions du Parti Communiste Français. 1947. Pp. 17.) *Le Parti Communiste, les Intellectuels et la Nation.* By Laurent Casanova. (Paris: Éditions Sociales. 1949. Pp. 141. Second, considerably enlarged, edition, 1950.) *Responsabilités de l'Intellectuel Communiste.* By Laurent Casanova.

Communism in giving new life to science and in making it clear that the choice is between "a criminal science preparing atomic destruction and a joyful science which populates the deserts." Vassails, echoing almost identical sentiments expressed by Sereni, writes that there has been a deliberate abandonment of scientific rationalism and that reactionary ideologies today find their direct expression in the works of physicists. Against the obscurantist bourgeois physics, however, is the Soviet system of theoretical physics based upon a belief that all the processes of nature follow discoverable laws. Some atomic laws are already known; all the others will be known. There is no Communist abandonment of the certainty that the universe will be mastered, in spite of the cowardly admission of bourgeois physicists that there is a realm which the human mind cannot ever hope to penetrate.

Sereni quotes with approval Gramsci's contention that to create a new culture does not merely mean to develop new ideas; it means, above all, to spread and socialize already discovered truths and to make them a vital foundation of socially meaningful decisions. The common direction of cultural efforts is both inevitable and necessary. Benedetto Croce has been directing Italian culture for fifty years and the Sacred College of Cardinals and the Congregation of the Index have been doing so for an even longer period of time. Why should the Soviet Union be criticized for directive efforts undertaken democratically by a Party which counts millions of militants and followers? Sereni bemoans the fate of his daughter who, in a public school of the Italian Republic, is taught by a priest that "the witches were possessed by the devil and the Church was right to have them burned at the stake. Such things are taught in the capital of Italy where physics is studied only one hour a week, while two hours are devoted to witches and allied topics."

The final reminder addressed by Casanova to the intellectuals who have finally joined the Party is that while discussion must be free, it can be started only by the Party and cannot be directed against it. While the Party is a voluntary association, it would be destroyed ideologically and politically, as Lenin said, if it did not eliminate those members who propagate ideas contrary to its principles. But, clearly, the rigorous requirements imposed upon the intellectuals by the Communist Parties of Western Europe have not acted as a noticeable deterrent or eliminated the sense of common purpose, security and prestige which many still associate with the support of Communism.

(Paris: Éditions de La Nouvelle Critique. 1949. Pp. 32.) *Science Bourgeoise et Science Prolétarienne.* By Francis Cohen, Jean Desanti, Raymond Guyot and Gérard Vassails, with an introduction by Laurent Casanova. (Paris: Éditions de La Nouvelle Critique. 1950. Pp. 47.) *Scienza, Marxismo, Cultura.* By Emilio Sereni. (Milan: Edizioni Sociali. 1949. Pp. 249.) *Esame di Coscienza di un Comunista.* By Fabrizio Onofri, with preface by Gian Carlo Pajetta. (Milan: Milano-Sera Editrice. 1949. Pp. 123.) *La Nouvelle Critique* has also published a series of translations of Russian and other tracts dealing with the problem of culture: *La Littérature et la Démocratie Populaire.* By Joseph Revaï. (Paris: Éditions de La Nouvelle Critique. 1950. Pp. 39.) *Sur la Littérature, la Philosophie et la Musique.* By Andreï Jdanov. (Paris: Éditions de La Nouvelle Critique. 1950. Pp. 94.)

Economic Problems

The main economic target of the Communists since 1948 has, of course, been the Marshall Plan, which has been interpreted as a device to meet a domestic American crisis and to conquer for American monopolists the markets of Europe.[30] But the internal problems have not been forgotten. Italian Communists have produced two compilations to prove the alleged monopolistic structure of Italian industry.[31] The material offered is of limited interest. But since the history of the industrial development of Italy has never been the object of intensive studies, these two volumes may conceivably be useful as a starting point for some future serious inquiry. To this group of studies belongs, in part, another book of Garaudy,[32] who reaches not unexpected conclusions in his analysis of the Catholic Church: "The temporal power of Pope Pius XII had become by 1949 so great as to compare in a certain sense with that of Pope Innocent III. . . . Economic and political power is no longer founded in the twentieth century on landed property. . . . Within the framework of capitalism, the control of banks and of industries through capital investments is the source of a power more real than that coming from the land. The Papacy controls today this modern form of temporal power: the Vatican is a very great capitalistic power, a trust, or more exactly, a giant international holding company."

The land problem in Italy, with all its difficulties, has been a fruitful source of Communist agitation. However, Italian Communists have never been quite clear as to the ultimate purposes of their program.[33] One point of agreement appears to be the breakup of all estates over 250 acres. But on the question of individual holdings versus cooperative or collective farms considerable vagueness prevails, as Italian Communists try not to wound the traditional sensitivity of the peasants. In France, there has been less reticence in stating what the ultimate position of the Party is to be.[34] We are told that no change has occurred between 1921 and 1949. The Party has recently republished in full the text of the "Theses on the Agrarian Question of the French Communist Party" adopted in November, 1921, in which we read: "The revolutionary task is that of preparing the peasants to face the new problems . . . and of substituting the notion of a common interest for that of individual interest. The use of heavy machinery . . . the participation in production and exchange cooperatives will tear the peasant away from his present isolation and will lead him to understand that his interest lies not in conflict with his fellow peasants or in merely living next to them, but in living with them in an ever closer collaboration. . . . Defeated by the new technology, by the propaganda of speech, press and school, egoism will disappear. The peasants will form productive associations in increasing numbers, waiting for the dawn of the day when of their own free will they will destroy the boundary lines which have kept them divided for centuries." If anyone doubts that full-fledged agrarian collectivism is also the goal of Western Communism, it is because of the failure to take notice of public and official declarations of policy.

---

[30] Typical is the official Italian Communist Party pamphlet *Il Piano Marshall e i Comunisti.* (Rome: Centro Diffusione Stampa del P.C.I. 1949. Pp. 113.)

[31] *Organizzazione del Capitale Finanziario Italiano.* By Radar, with a preface by Antonio Pesenti. (Rome: Edizioni Italiane. 1948. Pp. 397.) *Struttura dei Monopoli Industriali in Italia.* By the Confederazione Generale Italiana del Lavoro, Ufficio Statistica. (Rome: Casa Editrice Progresso. 1949. Pp. 399.)

[32] *L'Église, le Communisme et les Chrétiens.* By Roger Garaudy. (Paris: Éditions Sociales. 1949. Pp. 397.)

[33] *La Questione Agraria nella Rinascita Nazionale Italiana.* By Emilio Sereni. (Rome: Einaudi. 1946. Pp. 461.) *Il Mezzogiorno all'Opposizione.* By Emilio Sereni. (Turin: Einaudi. 1948. Pp. 165.) *Introduzione alla Riforma Agraria.* By Ruggero Grieco. (Turin: Einaudi. 1949. Pp. 333.) *I Comunisti e la Lotta per la Riforma Agraria.* By Ruggero Grieco. (Rome: Centro Diffusione Stampa del P.C.I. 1949. Pp. 77.)

[34] *Le Parti Communiste et la Question Paysanne.* Preface by Waldeck Rochet. (Paris: Éditions Sociales. 1949. Pp. 54.)

The Press

With its task greatly facilitated by the law of April 11, 1946, creating the *Société Nationale des Entreprises de Presse*, French Communism has been able to multiply immeasurably the number and scope of its publications. To a lesser extent, the same observation can also be made regarding Italian Communism. The two official dailies are *l'Humanité*, published in Paris, and *l'Unità*, published in Rome. Provincial editions of both papers are also printed. The Italian Party has only two weeklies of national significance: *Gioventù Nuova* and *Vie Nuove*. The French Party has at least five: *Action*, a highbrow theoretical paper; *France Nouvelle; Vie Ouvrière*, the official organ of the General Confederation of Labor; *La Terre*, a publication for the use of farmers; *Les Lettres Françaises*, one of the most widely read literary weeklies.

The first issue of *Les Lettres Françaises* had been prepared by Jacques Decour who was, along with Politzer and Solomon, arrested and shot by the Nazis before he could publish it. Twenty issues were later published by the underground. Since 1944 the weekly has had a notable success and has published articles by Julien Benda, Vercors, Martin-Chauffier, Albert Bayet and many others, together with articles by full-fledged Party members.

Italian monthlies or quarterlies include: *Rinascita*, edited by Togliatti and labelled merely a "review of Italian politics and culture," although it must be considered an official Communist Party publication; *Movimento Operaio*, devoted to the history of the Italian working-class movement; and *Società*, a Florentine quarterly of Communist intellectuals which publishes material of considerable historical value. Among French publications are: *Cahiers du Communisme*, the official organ of the Central Committee of the French Communist Party; *La Nouvelle Critique*, edited by Jean Kanapa, the most polemical organ of rigidly orthodox French Communism; *Démocratie Nouvelle*, edited by Jacques Duclos, with more practical political interests; and *La Pensée*, with predominantly scientific interests and claimed by Maurice Thorez himself on April 2, 1950, to be the main intellectual French Communist magazine (in spite of earlier denials of such clear identification). It is perhaps permissible to list a para-Communist monthly, *Des Chrétiens Prennent Position*, the bulletin of Christian Progressives. The French Communist Party has also been publishing for twenty-five years an almanac for peasants and workers,[35] a useful and amusing collection of data on the Party and on many other matters.

IV. THOSE ON THE OUTSIDE

The Church

The body of officially inspired Church literature against Communism is less impressive than the sustained and widespread battle carried out by the Church through the direct action of its ecclesiastical and lay organs. While the Church is under no illusion as to its fate in a Communist Europe, it has failed to produce or to inspire any very important theoretical effort aimed at Communism. A few commentaries have appeared dealing with the decree of the Holy Office of July 1,1949, and interpreting it as aimed essentially to strengthen well-established policies of the Church: on the one hand, to resist energetically the seductions of Communism and, on the other hand, to understand and support in full the rightful claims of the working classes.[36] The position still taken by some of the more important spokesmen of French Catholic Workers' Action is that some kind of communication with the Communists must be continued and that a careful distinction must be drawn between what we "love" and what we "reject" in Communism.[37]

From sources close to the Vatican and such centers of Catholic thought as *La Civiltà Cattolica* has come a series of generic commentaries on the failings of Communism in achieving the ideals of a Christian social justice.[38] More fruitful appears a symposium on the philosophy of Communism prepared under the auspices of the Academy of St. Thomas[39] where, among other essays, Father Morlion, O.P., has an interesting analysis of the major themes of Communism, which he classifies as the theme of economic security; the theme of social equality; the theme of the political power of the working class which includes the collectivistic myth and the fighting discipline of the Communist Party; and the theme of human brotherhood which includes the subsidiary themes of sacrifice, human dignity and peace. These themes flow from three fundamental psychological attitudes. The first is materialistic absolutism. Economic security has become an ultimate value to which every other consideration must be subordinated. The second is social utopianism. In the contemporary world, the Communist sees only the defects, and his longing for the better society of the future leads him to lose sight of the limited possibilities of human nature. The third is a radical pessimism which compels the Communist to place his whole faith in a revolutionary act and in the total destruction of the existing social-political order. This attitude is founded on a belief that man cannot with his own unaided strength do away with existing evil, but must rely on the myths of the dictatorship of the proletariat, of universal revolution and of Five-Year Plans.[40]

---

[35] The current one is *Almanach Ouvrier-Paysan 1950.* (Paris: Éditions Sociales. 1950. Pp. 288.)

[36] *Peut-On Collaborer avec les Communistes? Voici* . . . . By Père Marie-Paul Sève. (Paris: Bonne Presse. 1950. Pp. 62.) The decree said that Catholics could not become Party members or contribute to the distribution of Communist printed matter. It denied admission to the sacraments for those Catholics who knowingly and of free will either became members or helped spread Communist propaganda; and it also provided for the excommunication of those Catholics who defended Communist doctrine. These penalties have been seldom invoked.

[37] P. Bigo, "Le Communisme et Nous," *Revue de l'Action Populaire*, December, 1950, pp. 725–744.

[38] *Comunismo e Giustizia Sociale Cristiana.* By Mons. Giuseppe Angrisani. (Turin: Marietti. 1949. Pp. 217.) *Il Comunismo.* By Angelo Brucculeri, S.J. (Rome: Edizioni "La Civiltà Cattolica." 1944. Pp. 116.)

[39] *La Filosofia del Comunismo: Atti della Settimana di Studio Indetta dall'Accademia di S. Tommaso, 19–24 Aprile 1949.* (Turin: Marietti. 1949. Pp. 273.)

Socialists and Bourgeoisie

The centenary of the Communist Manifesto provided a good opportunity for a review of the Communist claim that their present doctrine is rooted in the traditions of Western Europe. Many Socialists have judged this to be a baseless claim. The development of Marxism since 1848 has been a "forced march, a kind of dialectical goose step. . . . History is no longer the realization of human freedom, . . . it becomes an abstract scheme, a track which man can either follow faithfully and remain a good militant, or leave and become a traitor. This is the deep reason, the original sin, which led Marxism to dictatorship." The totalitarianism of Stalin and of modern Communism is the very opposite of the Jacobinism and humanism of French Socialists who must try to find, amidst the ruins, a new and necessary scale of human values.[41]

The Socialists have been aware of the handicap under which they have been laboring when competing with the Communists on a common Marxist platform. The task was clearly that of re-writing a new Socialist philosophy that would not be Marxist. "The Communist Party can militate with coherence for statism against individualism, for the one-party system against the parliamentary system, for violent revolution against evolution and remain in the straight line of descent of Marxist thought. In so far as Socialism is against all this . . . French Socialism is not Marxist."[42] In general the European Socialists have been far from successful in clarifying their position with regard to Communism and Marxism, and their failure is reflected in their loss of strength.

---

[40] A serious effort at critical analysis of Soviet literature on dialectical materialism undertaken by Father Wetter of the faculty of the Pontifical Oriental Institute in Rome should also be mentioned here: *Il Materialismo Dialettico Sovietico.* By Gustavo A. Wetter, S.J. (Turin: Einaudi. 1948. Pp. xxiii, 431.) The book is divided into an historical section which, starting from Hegel and Marx, carries the story to Lenin, the mechanistic school, the Menshevik idealism of Deborin and Trotsky, and comes down to the Metin and Stalin contributions of the '30s. This historical discussion is followed by a systematic criticism of Soviet dialectical materialism.

[41] See, as typical of the rejection of the Communist version of Marxism, *La Tragédie du Marxisme.* By Michel Collinet. (Paris: Calmann-Lévy. 1948. Pp. 337.) *De Marx au Marxisme 1848–1948.* Edited by Robert Aron. (Paris: Éditions de Flore. 1948. Pp. 319.)

[42] Armand Pierhal, "Socialisme et Communisme en France," *La Nef,* June–July, 1950, pp. 145–150. This article is included in a special issue bearing the title "Le Socialisme Français, Victime du Marxisme?"

In 1947, the editors of *Confluences*[43] undertook to ask a group of intellectuals belonging to all political faiths these questions: (1) One can accept the Marxist criticism of capitalist economy and of bourgeois morality. Must this acceptance of doctrine imply an acceptance of the political consequences? (2) Are we confronted with the unacceptable dilemma of Sartre, "to betray, in the name of truth, the interests of the oppressed, or to betray truth in order to serve the proletariat"? (3) Again, quoting Sartre, "this materialism which denies radically the freedom of man has become the most radical instrument of his freedom." Must we, in order to obtain economic freedom, sacrifice the other freedoms? (4) Gabriel Péri, who died for *les lendemains qui chantent,* died for a future he did not know. Does this mean that we have the right to ask men to sacrifice themselves for this hypothetical future and to apply to the political world those eternal and rigid views that we have so far accepted only for the metaphysical world? The non-Communists usually answered by refusing to accept the premises. The Communists either replied that the questioners should first read the daily papers and speak their mind on the questions of income taxes, the Ruhr and reparations (Kanapa), or suggested that to agree with Sartre on the denial of freedom implied in materialism revealed a complete ignorance of the meaning of dialectical materialism (Lefebvre). In conclusion, the editor expressed the fear that the break between the two worlds is already complete.

Other writers, such as Pollès in his rather turgid "psychoanalytical treatise"[44] and Monnerot,[45] who presents an able analysis of the development of the new ruling classes of technicians, bureaucrats and army men in the Soviet Union, express the same belief. The major prophet of the impossibility of any collaboration with the Communists is Raymond Aron, the brilliant writer and newspaperman who was for a time considered to be very close to General De Gaulle.[46] According to Aron, the only tenable position towards a sect, which is both a military and religious one, is total acceptance of its beliefs or total rejection. He finds it true that anti-Communism is the gathering point of fear, of egoism and of privilege. But then, no cause is pure and we should have no hesitation in admitting that Communism has long since left behind its heroic phase. It too is the gathering point of a ruthless will to power, of cynicism and of short-term opportunism. In *Le Grand Schisme,* Aron's alternative to Communist dictatorship was an integrated government to be headed by De Gaulle.

---

[43] *Questions du Communisme.* Edited by Roger Stéphane. (Paris: Confluences. Nos. 18–20. 1947. Pp. 344.)

[44] *Psychanalyse du Communisme.* By Henri Pollès. (Paris: Éditions Henri Lefebvre. 1949. Pp. 569.)

[45] *Sociologie du Communisme.* By Jules Monnerot. (Paris: Gallimard (NRF). 1949. Pp. 510.)

[46] *Le Grand Schisme.* By Raymond Aron. (Paris: Gallimard [NRF]. 1948. Pp. 346.)

"The Traitors"

Communist recruits come in the main from two sources (apart from those who become Communists because of maladjustments in their personal lives). First, there are those who have accepted Communism as a result of a clearly felt intellectual crisis.[47] Second, there are those who have gone over to Communism because of the sufferings which an unjust and oppressive world has inflicted on them. The classical book describing the complexities of the reverse movement from Communism to anti-Communism is, of course, *The God That Failed.*[48] In Europe, Gide's and Spender's agonies have not been taken very seriously, while the Communism of Silone and Wright has seemed to one writer to be of the kind that is born of physical and moral poverty and not of the reading of Marxian texts.[49] Of the six, only Koestler and Silone played an important role in Communist parties. In consequence, the Communist reaction was extremely violent in their cases.[50]

A similar Communist attack was made on Kravchenko, following the publication of *I Chose Freedom* and the subsequent judicial action brought by him against the French Communist weekly, *Les Lettres Françaises*, for alleged defamation. The publication of the nearly complete court proceedings of the Kravchenko trial provides an entertaining and fairly useful body of information on French Communism.[51] As the witnesses parade before the court, each is appropriately and sometimes picturesquely described by defense counsel. M. Louis Martin-Chauffier is "a great writer and a great patriot." Fernand Grenier, the Communist Deputy and leader, is introduced as a "baker who by dint of intelligence and will has achieved a remarkable degree of culture and prophetic power." Pierre Courtade, the foreign correspondent of *l'Humanité*, tells the court what he knows about the American technique of writing a newspaper story. Its chief ingredient is the element of human interest; "one finds a story, true or not, this doesn't matter, and one gives it personal color." Pierre Debray speaks as a Catholic and as the first to have contested in France the authenticity of Kravchenko's book. Albert Bayet, professor at the Sorbonne, applies the methods which have been developed in France over a hundred years, from Renan and Fustel de Coulanges to Seignobos, to test the credibility of any historical work. Roger Garaudy undertakes to compare *I Chose Freedom* to Flaubert's *Bouvard et Pécuchet,* even though he apologizes to Flaubert for mentioning him under such unpleasant circumstances. Jean Cassou, a "man of letters" who has since broken with the Communists, provides a "testimonial of morality" for Claude Morgan, editor of *Les Lettres Françaises.* Pierre Cot, the para-Communist Deputy and constitutionalist, and others parade across the witness stand.

---

[47] A good example of the rebellion of the intellectual is that of Charlotte Haldane, J.B.S.'s wife: *Truth Will Out.* By Charlotte Haldane. (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson. 1949. Pp. 339.)

[48] *The God That Failed.* By Arthur Koestler, Ignazio Silone, Richard Wright, André Gide, Louis Fischer, Stephen Spender; Richard Crossman, editor. (New York: Harper and Brothers. 1949. Pp. 273.) French edition: *Le Dieu des Ténèbres.* (Paris: Callman-Lévy. 1950.)

[49] See the review of the book by Jean-Marie Domenach in *Esprit,* November, 1950, p. 713.

[50] On Koestler, see *Le Traitre et le Prolétaire, ou l'Entreprise Koestler and Co. Ltd.* By Jean Kanapa. (Paris: Éditions Sociales. 1950. Pp. 64.) On Silone, see *La Documentation Française, Articles et Documents*, February 3, 1950, No. 1,772, a special issue on the Silone case which includes a long letter by Togliatti recounting the events which led, according to the Italian Communist leader, to the "expulsion" of Silone from the Party. In substance, this action allegedly resulted from Silone's refusal to follow the pre-Popular Front Stalin line of attack against all democratic parties declared guilty of "social-Fascism."

[51] *Le Procès Kravchenko: Compte Rendu Sténographique.* (Paris: Éditions Albin Michel. 1949. 2 Vols. Pp. 678, 648.)

The "Déchirés"

Not all the "worshippers from afar" have been able to make a clean break or to resolve their mental conflicts. Europe is full of tormented spirits who are confronted by the dilemma described by the psychologist Merleau-Ponty as follows: "One cannot be anti-Communist, one cannot be Communist."[52] Julien Benda is dissatisfied with Maurice Thorez's use of dialectical materialism not as a dogma but as a guide to action. The result of such use is "that the doctrine has nothing to do, no matter what is said, with the disinterested search for truth, a search which must be the fundamental trait of the scientific spirit."[53] A society in which he would not be able to write one single line except as it conformed to the official doctrine is one that he would not personally desire at all, even though he thinks that such restraints "are inevitable in a society which wishes to be strong." But apart from doctrinal differences, Benda nearly always fully approves of Communist actions: "For the last fifty years, Communists have been the only ones, as a Party and without qualification, to defend those values of justice to which I, as a spokesman of many intellectuals, remain attached. They have defended them, no matter what their motivations, at the time of the Dreyfus affair and of the Ethiopian, Spanish and Czech affairs. They defend them today in their positions on epuration, on Franco, and in their determination to see that the working class be represented in the government. It is not my fault if I must link my hands with those of a Party whose theses I mostly reject, since the bourgeoisie to which I belong by birth, education and taste has for the past fifty years betrayed in the most cynical fashion the values it should defend."[54]

The theoreticians of the *Rassemblement Démocratique Révolutionnaire* are a little more certain of their grounds.[55] Rousset maintains that to accuse

---

[52] *Humanisme et Terreur, Essai sur le Problème Communiste.* By Maurice Merleau-Ponty. (Paris: Gallimard [NRF]. 1947. Pp. xliii, 206.)

[53] *Trois Idoles Romantiques: Le Dynamisme, l'Existentialisme, la Dialectique Matérialiste.* By Julien Benda. (Geneva: Éditions du Mont Blanc. 1948. Pp. 175.)

[54] *Ordre,* September 4, 1947. Quoted in *Nouveau Dictionnaire des Girouettes.* By Orion. (Paris: Éditions Le Régent. 1948. Pp. 347.) This is an entertaining collection of contradictory utterances of public men, fashioned after the original *Dictionnaire des Girouettes,* published in 1815.

[55] *Entretiens sur la Politique.* By J-P. Sartre, David Rousset, Gérard Rosenthal. (Paris: Gallimard [NRF]. 1949. Pp. 215.)

Marxism of statism means to identify it with the Stalinist experience which is foreign and antagonistic to it. Today the militant Communist is a mere executor of decisions, an agent of the state. We are ourselves, Sartre adds, democrats and revolutionaries and wholly on the side of the proletariat. The difference between our position and that of the Communists lies in the fact that while the Communists "want to use the masses, we want to free them. Where they think bureaucratically, we are thinking of concrete freedoms." In the third volume of his collected essays,[56] he expresses the conviction that there are serious differences of interpretation of Marxist doctrine within the Communist ranks: "Can there be a greater difference than between the naïve scientism of Garaudy and the philosophy of Hervé? . . . It is not by chance that we witness today a crisis of the Marxian spirit and that it resigns itself to accept Garaudy as a spokesman. The Communists are caught between the obsolescence of the materialistic myth and their fear of weakening their troops by adopting a new ideology. The best keep silent and the silence is filled with the chattering of the imbeciles." The difficulty is that Sartre himself is not at all clear in his new "revolutionary philosophy" which, going beyond both bourgeois idealism and Communist materialism, seeks to establish a philosophy of "total man."

Merleau-Ponty cannot reject the ideas of violence and of dictatorship. The Marxian program of violence and dictatorship is acceptable because it seeks to create a new humanity in which the workers, at present deprived of their country, of their work and of their own lives, will be able to look up toward a better future. But the Communist dictatorship of today rules out any significant participation of the proletariat themselves: "We therefore find ourselves in an inextricable position. The Marxian criticism of capitalism remains valid and the anti-Sovietism of today parallels the brutality, the pride, the folly that have already found their expression in Fascism. On the other hand, the revolution has become static on a reactionary position and maintains and aggravates the dictatorial structure in giving up the revolutionary freedom of the proletariat."

The acceptance of Communist goals, along with the rejection of Soviet practices, again reappears in a joint declaration of a group of Resistance leaders.[57] "We remain firmly attached to a program of rational reconstruction of institutions founded on social justice and human dignity, in a word, to Socialism. . . . The USSR, whose immense effort has long since attracted our active sympathy, remains an example, but for the Western world it cannot be taken as a model." To Martin-Chauffier, whose tragic experiences in a Nazi concentration camp have been movingly recounted in his *L'Homme et la Bête*, capitalism means liberty without justice, but the Soviet Union means justice without liberty. Europe must seek liberty and justice: "This is the task of Europe. Europe remains the one community in the world to keep alive the notion of man which has been slowly elaborated in centuries of dialogue between Christian humanism and agnostic humanism. It is the one part of the world where Socialism can best be realized with the least violence and alteration of principles which are not new for Europe. A Socialism which will incorporate, with all its humanity and with all its strength, the ideals of Communism, whose main weakness is its rigidity and whose main virtue is its rigor. Clever in manipulating ideals, in clarifying them rather than in obfuscating them, . . . on familiar terms with revolutions whose sweep will leave behind not ruins but a pure and clear perspective, Europe has acquired enough wisdom and practice . . . to be able to bless and render fruitful the legitimate union of freedom and social justice." And if Europe cannot nourish this hope, Vercors believes it better for her to be destroyed by an atom bomb. Together with Jean Cassou in 1949 he denounced Soviet Communism as not keeping faith with the people. But even then he summed up his position in this way: "I love humanity above all and France because it has been the symbol of its destiny for the last 150 years, and the Communist Party because it is the only one which wants and can . . . fulfill this destiny and promise man his liberation. As long as the Communist Party will not abandon these admirable goals, I will never be counted amongst its enemies. . . . If one day the Party should be attacked, I will be found fighting in its ranks. But, if in its name a mistake or a crime is committed, or simply a lie is told, it will be my love for humanity and my respect for the Party . . . which will lead me to denounce such acts without reserve."[58]

---

[56] *Situations, III.* By Jean-Paul Sartre. (Paris: Gallimard [NRF]. 1949. Pp. 311.)

[57] *L'Heure du Choix.* By Claude Aveline, Jean Cassou, André Chamson, Georges Friedmann, Louis Martin-Chauffier, Vercors. (Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit. 1947. Pp. 170.)

The Christian Progressives

The Christian Progressives, because of their importance, are entitled to special separate consideration in this anthology of the *déchirés*. The leadership of the Italian Christian Democratic Party, as the principal bearer of political responsibilities in the country since 1946, has been able to exert sufficient control over the radical fringes of the Party to still the voices of those Catholics who felt any kind of sympathy for Communism. As a result, the few who have broken away from Christian Democracy have found it necessary to go all the way in their shift towards Communism.[59] On the other hand, Christian Progressivism, aided by Christian Existentialism and Personalism, has made greater headway in France, providing Communists with valuable propaganda material. The most celebrated case is that of the erstwhile abbot, Jean Boulier, one-time professor of international law at the Catholic University of Paris. The Christian cannot, Boulier argues, accept the fundamental law of bourgeois society—that of making money. But the Christian can be a good member of the Communist state where he will work with all his heart for the success of the Socialist order.[60] The materialism of those who try to fight the Communists with the atom bomb is worse than the materialism of the Communists themselves. In his preface to a pamphlet by Pierre Debray,[61] Boulier hopes that, since Catholicism is not an individualistic but a communal faith, an agreement between Rome and Moscow will be possible, if the Church is granted freedom of association, of preaching and of communication. The real conflict is between the United States, a civilization of gentleman gangsters bent upon delivering the atom bomb in airplanes which have yielded millions of dollars of profits to their manufacturers, and the Communist world, engaged in the creation of the man described by St. Paul; for Communist man has, according to Boulier, "that touch of sweetness, tolerance, goodness and human tenderness, that certitude on the glory of truth which, as a perfume, reveals the Christian soul." Debray reënforces the picture by comparing the madness of Forrestal to the impressive majesty of the Georgian bishop of Vaktanga and by saying that what has struck him most in the Soviet Union is the Communist cult of truth.[62]

---

[58] Jean Cassou and Vercors, "Il Ne Faut Pas Tromper le Peuple," *Esprit*, December, 1949, pp. 943–953. For a Communist answer, see *Reponse à Jean Cassou*. By André Wurmser. (Paris: Éditions de La Nouvelle Critique. 1950. Pp. 32.)

[59] As typical examples, the names of Ada Alessandrini and Franco Rodano may be mentioned. Rodano is a regular contributor to *Rinascita*. See also his article "Il Discorso di Pio XII agli Operai Belgi," *Società*, December, 1949, pp. 681–691. It deals chiefly with the decree of the Holy Office on Communism.

[60] *Un Prêtre Prend Position*. By Jean Boulier. (Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit. 1949. Pp. 79.)

The position of many Christian Existentialists is also pro-Marxist and pro-Communist.[63] For Lacroix it is impossible to dissociate oneself from Marxism; for Bartoli Communism represents the end of that total "alienation" of man which was the main characteristic of the nineteenth century; for Vancourt Marxism involves at least a partial attempt to re-integrate man in the movement of history and to give him the weapons to bring to an end the crying injustices which dishonor mankind.

The position taken by the founder of Personalism, Emmanuel Mounier, remains the most tormented and tragic of all.[64] His long editorship of *Esprit*, during which time the magazine became one of the most influential journals of opinion of France, bears witness to his longing for justice as well as to his hopes that Communism could become one of the instruments of justice and freedom. His last article, published shortly before his death,[65] revealed an awareness of the terrible price being paid by those who had accepted Communism. The question now, according to Mounier, was to find out whether modern technology did not change the revolutionary process, which should be one in the direction of liberation, into one in the direction of death. But even if this were found to be true, a final rupture between Communists and other groups must be avoided, and this because Communism was still identified with the proletariat. Mounier was not a Communist but he refused to join in the exorcisms of the pessimists, led by Koestler, or in those of the optimists, led by everybody else. "For against pessimism we have a faith. Against optimism, the haunting vision of the world's injustice."[66]

---

[61] *Un Catholique Retour de l'U.R.S.S.* By Pierre Debray. (Paris: Éditions du Pavillon. 1950. Pp. 140.)

[62] For other examples, see André Mandouze, "Prendre la Main Tendue," in *Les Chrétiens et la Politique*. By Henri Guillemin, André Mandouze, Paul Ricoeur, Georges Hourdin, Daniel Villey, M. I. Montuclard. (Paris: Éditions du Temps Présent. 1948. Pp. 169.) For a witty attack on Catholics such as Debray, see *Un Jeune Catholique Devient Communiste Malgré les Cordiaux Avertissements de Louis Salleron*. By Louis Salleron. (Paris: Le Jeune Parque. 1949. Pp. 81.)

[63] *Marxisme et Pensée Chrétienne*. By R. Vancourt. (Paris: Bloud & Gay. 1947. Pp. 301.) *Doctrine Économique et Sociale de Karl Marx*. By Henri Bartoli. (Paris: Éditions du Seuil. 1950. Pp. 413.) *Marxisme, Existentialisme, Personnalisme: Présence de l'Éternité dans le Temps*. By Jean Lacroix. (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France. 1950. Pp. 120.)

[64] Among his books, see: *Révolution Personnaliste et Communautaire*. Paris. 1934. *Liberté sous Condition*. Paris. 1946. *Qu'est-ce que le Peronnalisme?* Paris. 1947.

[65] Emmanuel Mounier, "Fidélité," *Esprit*, February, 1950, pp. 177–182.

MARIO EINAUDI.

Cornell University.

---

[66] On the work of Emmanuel Mounier, see the special issue of *Esprit*, published in December, 1950. Of special importance are the brilliant essays by François Goguel, *Positions Politiques*, pp. 797–819, and by Jean-Marie Domenach, *Les Pricipes du Choix Politique*, pp. 820–838. On the Communist reaction to the doubts of *Esprit* and its editor, note *La Nouvelle Critique* for April, 1950, and *Lettre à Emmanuel Mounier, Homme d'"Esprit."* By Roger Garaudy. (Paris Éditions de La Nouvelle Critique. 1950. Pp. 17.)

BOOK REVIEWS

Our More Perfect Union; From Eighteenth-Century Principles to Twentieth-Century Practice. BY ARTHUR N. HOLCOMBE. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1950. Pp. xiii, 460. $6.00.)

Some political scientists believe that many of their colleagues have put an interest in political reform ahead of the development of their discipline as a science. It is less commonly remarked that the ardent reforming spirit has hurt political science as a humanistic or literary field of study, by weakening its appreciation of the place of the American constitutional tradition in the broad historical stream of Western culture. As political scientists, many of us may be so eager to avoid the pride of Bancroft that we fall into the opposite error of undue humility about the strong points of our own political system.

The latest major work of Professor Holcombe does not make this error. As a constitutional and historical essay, it has most appropriately been awarded the Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial Foundation Award for the best publication during 1950 in the field of government and human welfare.

Professor Holcombe notes that the three main aspects of our constitutional tradition since James Madison have been federalism, the separation of powers, and limitation on the powers of majorities. These three theories, he believes, not only have been generally sound for the United States, but they may be the guides on which we may base the future development of the United Nations.

This thesis is, of course, in harmony with the general theories that Professor Holcombe has developed in earlier works. He rejects the theory of class conflict in order to examine the political role of the middle class, and therefore he refuses to identify either party, in a two-party system, with a simple class interest. This is consistent with his denial of the classic views of party responsibility; to Professor Holcombe, party government exists along with constitutional government, and is tempered by it. In this pluralistic position he naturally does not accept the centralizing logic of the parliamentary or cabinet system, any more than he accepts the logic of socialism.

The middle class—and in modern times the urban middle class—therefore has the role, in Professor Holcombe's theoretical system, of maintaining through constitutional government the political balance that is so easily upset by class warfare or by unlimited party dogmatism.

In developing this thesis, Professor Holcombe is at his best as he combines the roles of political scientist and constitutional historian. This is not a role in which experimentation and objective proof are possible, and some will doubtless disagree not only with his general theory but with some details of his interpretation. Yet he has done a remarkable job of setting forth the main traditions of American government in a way that explains some of the unique aspects of politics in the United States. I can think of no better book, for example, to explain to a well-informed Englishman why the presuppositions of British government do not apply to the American constitutional or party system.

By a distinction between constitutional government and party government, Professor Holcombe seeks to explain the difference between that aspect of our government which works by fairly formal patterns, and that part which is more flexible and adjusts itself to current pressures. But the idea of "party government" may cramp Professor Holcombe somewhat in his portrayal of the flexible and informal aspects of our constitutional system. It takes into account past history and party politics more adequately than current administrative politics.

For example, he is realistic in observing that patronage has been a source of weakness rather than of strength in the President's relations with Congress. On the other hand, he seems to this writer unrealistic in believing that the President has grown in strength by reason of the existence of "the present tremendous military establishment under the orders of the President as commander in chief." Surely this is too simple an interpretation, in view of the role of the various congressional committees that deal with foreign and military affairs, and of the extent to which the professional military corps (up to and including the Joint Chiefs and SCAP) develop policies of their own at home and abroad. Similarly, Professor Holcombe notes that the Constitutional Convention rejected the idea of a formal executive council as an institution which would have weakened the President. But as he recommends the formal creation of a joint legislative-executive council, he does not seem to answer the question (which is suggested by his own general constitutional theory) how the responsibilities of the President can be reconciled with the determination of individual congressmen to resist party discipline.

Professor Holcombe dissents mildly from the "somewhat mystical conclusion" of A. Lawrence Lowell, who believed that men attain harmonious systems of politics by striving for immediate ends without understanding the general results toward which they work. At the same time, he suggests that "the improvement of the American system tends naturally to coincide with the improvement of the political structure and processes of the civilized world"—indeed, that the federal system of the United States is now unbalanced by the nature of international relations and cannot perfect itself except as a part of "a more perfect Union of all mankind."

But, even though Professor Holcombe's faith that this is the hidden plan of Nature may seem almost as mystical as Lowell's, he ends with the hope that the principles of American constitutional development, without being copied in any detail, may help those who want a more perfect union of nations to bring about a "triumph of human reason over the rival agencies of accident and force in the evolution of political society."

Even those who quarrel most violently with some of Professor Holcombe's detailed interpretations may well agree in that hope.

DON K. PRICE.

Public Administration Clearing House.

Crisis in Britain; Plans and Achievements of the Labour Government. BY ROBERT BRADY. (Los Angeles: University of California Press. 1950. Pp. xiii, 730. $5.00.)

Five Years of British Labour, 1945–1950; A Symposium (Reprinted from the

Journal of Politics, Vol. 12, No. 2, May 1950). EDITED BY RENÉ DE VISME WILLIAMSON AND LEE S. GREENE. (Gainesville, Florida: Kallman Publishing Company. 1950. Pp. ix, 187–404. $2.00.)

There can hardly ever have been a more successful attempt to seize and assess a moment of crisis in a nation's affairs than that of Professor Brady in *Crisis in Britain.* The task was one of those difficult ones which would daunt any but the stoutest-hearted scholar. The attempt at bringing into being, quite suddenly, the better part of a long-prepared series of new institutions was one which could be really understood only by a native Britisher. This was because both the situation and the institutions were of such incredible complexity and had developed out of such a unique history.

It would not be quite true to say that Professor Brady's book is out-dated, though all its data are at least two years old and much of importance has happened since the voluminous notebooks on which it was based were closed. But neither the dangers of assessing a time-complicated economy and government, nor the discouragement of knowing that his study could never be usefully current prevented the application of an obvious vigor and industry to the task. The result is one which overcomes all criticism, and becomes the *précis* of a moment in time, a significant moment in the life of a people. For the British are just now passing through an ordeal to greatness or to swift decline. And this book will show, when the issue is decided, why the one or the other end came about. It does not make prediction concerning the outcome more certain, but it is likely to make explanation easier at some time in the future.

Of all this nation's historic difficulties, the comparative decline of her productive power is the most serious; for she could survive the alienation of the colonies if she could maintain markets and sources of materials in competition with other industrialized nations. She might not continue to be the rich center of a contributory Empire, but she might maintain her fifty million people at a satisfactory level of life. That this would require drastic reorganization most of her leaders have agreed for a long time; but they have differed radically about how to do it. These differences may not be nearly as considerable as the outsider would anticipate. Conservative and Labourite alike would transform the basic industries into national groups, subject to plan and central control; the Conservatives would leave a larger percentage in private ownership, organized into cartels, and the Labourites would go further with public ownership and operation. But neither of these views would run to the logical conclusion they seem to imply, in part because of the British penchant for compromise.

Professor Brady deals with all these difficulties and problems with urbanity. His appraisal of the Labourites' success is not alone in terms of what some more or less responsible leader has said it was; it rests on a broad foundation of collated documentation which is not the least valuable part of his book. Having stated the problems in such terms as can be made available, the procedure of assessment is made much easier. Thus nationalization as applied to the Bank of England, coal, electricity and gas, transport, and telecommunications, is reduced to its proper function—as one way of making industry more productive. And social security is seen to be a means for the creating of a nation more confident and more creative.

As far as these means to the end of national reconstruction have gone, they have not been controversial except as to detail, although there have been political irritations consequent on Labour's responsibility and the Conservatives' exclusion from it. The end of this agreement was reached when the nationalization of iron and steel became imminent. But the other measures rested solidly on numerous and exhaustive investigations by Royal Commissions, mostly appointed by Conservatives, whose recommendations they could not very well repudiate. All this mass of national introspection is summarized, and the logic of its issue in the legislation of 1945–50 is shown with great clarity.

There has not been time for the record of any of the new national ventures to extend itself measurably. There have been those in this country who have been altogether too quick in generalization about results. But Professor Brady's book ought to check this kind of carelessness by indicating how few alternatives there were to what has been done. For added to a long-run decline in productivity and deterioration of British power in the world, there was in 1945 the whole heritage of war loss and destruction to be assimilated and made good. It was a challenge only the most resolute courage could have accepted. The way in which it was met must make any visitor to that indomitable island humble and slow to pass judgment.

Britain has now chosen to regard her entire process of living and working as one whole to which all the members of her social body make contribution and from which they take sustenance. This is the meaning of nationalization, of fair shares in the distribution of goods, of the undertaking to maintain social security, of the organization of all activity within a surveyed framework. It is possible to ask whether the planning and social management contemplated or put in hand are adequate to such a conception. Professor Brady thinks they are not and this reviewer agrees with him. This is precisely where such studies as that undertaken in the symposium edited by Messrs. Williamson and Greene in the *Journal of Politics* are useful. For Britain—at least most of Britain—has not risen to general consciousness of what the undertaking to which the nation is committed inevitably requires.

Impressions of a slightly more optimistic nature flow from a reading of *Five Years of British Labour* than from *Crisis in Britain.* When Professor Brady wrote his last chapter of evaluation in 1949, the future seemed to him a very dark one. Britain, he thought, had undertaken an organismic society but had not implemented it. Hardly any of the vigorous reorganizations necessary to its successful management had been undertaken. Industrial relocation had not gone very far; the leakage of manpower back into useless service trades was considerable; scientific management was neglected even in the nationalized industries; and none of the indices foreshadowed the recovery of an export balance which would support the welfare state. At the same time there had been so little redirection of colonial and foreign policy that the burden of its conduct and the military expenditures to support it, already fantastically large, would grow rather than diminish; and a much more efficient industry in Japan and Germany would offer presently a competition which might be fatal to several old British trades.

In 1950, world affairs disposed themselves in such a way, however, as to postpone crises which seemed imminent in 1949. What had seemed like an increasingly difficult export situation turned again into a sellers' market and the penalties of failure to make any effectual gains in efficiency were not yet to be exacted. Labour squeezed through a February election with a greatly reduced minority, so small in fact that further controversial measures of any sort were abeyed. The year was a peculiar one of suspended progress of any sort—except by momentum. But if Britain, as appeared likely, should again greatly enlarge her expenditures for armament, it would at least absorb the gains from momentum and perhaps require another period of deepened austerity.

In assessing the gains from Labour's years of power, the authors of *Five Years of British Labour* could no more foresee these changes than could Professor Brady. They merely had a year or two more of experience to record. That this would seem a highly favorable record to Mr. Francis Williams, who had himself been so intimately associated with the Party, is perhaps natural. He had been an adviser to the Prime Minister from 1945 to 1947, after having been editor of Labour's newspaper, the *Daily Herald*. Most of the other contributors, however, are university professors, and so have a more detached view. So far as they offer general criticism it does not differ notably from the somewhat better documented treatment of Professor Brady. And certainly those in charge of developing Labour's policy can have derived very little comfort from its numerous acid comments.

Perhaps the most interesting of the articles is that on the Coal Board by Professor R. V. Presthus. In assessing its financial problems he finds himself up against the same difficulties, and even paradoxes, faced by others who have reviewed the nationalization schemes. The Board is neither clearly autonomous nor clearly a creature of the government. The role of the Minister of Fuel and Power *vis a vis* the Board is doubtful and vague, but this nebulous relationship is as true of the Minister of Transport *vis a vis* the Railway Executive. It is a symptom of such general uncertainty that better administration and clearer policies seem requisite to the success of the whole nationalization program.

On the whole, the turning of all this expert, if sympathetic, attention on Labour's record ought to be valuable. If it is on balance unfavorable, that is not because of prejudice; it is because the necessities of a hard world have not been met and are not likely to be met by the present measures. Something more is needed, something fundamental in the way of reorganization and revitalization.

REXFORD G. TUGWELL.

University of Chicago.

Morgenthau, the New Deal and Silver; A Story of Pressure Politics. By ALLAN SEYMOUR EVEREST. (New York: King's Crown Press, Columbia University. 1950. Pp. viii, 209. $3.50.)

Of all the types of monetary reform proposed in the past two decades, none has been more unanimously excoriated by economists than "doing something for silver." Yet no monetary reform group has been more effective in the Congress than the silverites.

Dr. Everest's brief volume describes the tactics by which the Senate silver bloc won most of its wishes and later beat off strong bipartisan attacks on its special privileges. By getting silver on the agenda of the London Economic Conference in 1933, Senator Pittman was able to negotiate a one-sided international agreement, ratification of which initiated domestic silver purchases. Meanwhile, the silver forces, by joining hands with other inflationist groups, had secured passage of the omnibus Thomas inflation amendment to the AAA Act with its broad permissive inflationary authorities, and subsequently forced adoption of mandatory silver purchases—both concessions as the price for support of "must" legislation. Since then, through the operations of the Special Senate Silver Committee, filibusters, legislative riders on appropriation bills, and vote-trading with other congressional groups, the silverites, despite temporary reverses, have succeeded in raising the domestic silver price to a mandatory level forty cents an ounce higher than when existing stocks were nationalized in 1934.

Primarily because of access to the 864-volume Morgenthau diary, Everest gives the best picture available to date of the role of the Secretary of the Treasury. While never an enthusiast for silver, the Secretary in the early years apparently was responsive to some of the arguments, as well as more willing to compromise with the silverites than was the President. Perhaps because of his 1933 experience in boosting farm prices by government purchases, he at first "took great satisfaction in watching silver rise" and was thrilled by its nationalization. Nevertheless, from the start he endeavored to minimize speculative benefits from the program, and by December, 1935, was thoroughly "disillusioned" with both the domestic and international aspects. Thereafter Treasury policy was confined to neutral execution of the Act—trying to get along with the potent silver bloc. Not until January, 1942, did the Secretary feel free to espouse publicly repeal of both domestic and foreign silver legislation. Soon, however, under an "informal truce" with the silverites, he confined his wartime efforts to legislative and administrative efforts to make Treasury silver available for war industry as well as for coinage purposes abroad.

In discussing the international impact of the silver program, Everest describes the major controversies between the Treasury and the State Department. While not competent to judge whether the State Department position is adequately presented, the reviewer has misgivings about the rationalizations the author accepts for using silver as "an important weapon of diplomacy."

With minor exceptions, the volume is of a high caliber. The influence of the mining industry on the silver legislation is perhaps over-emphasized—and the susceptibility of the general public in the West to historic silver dogma understated. Moreover, Everest does not comment on the significant political fact that the silver subsidy involves no budget expenditures (merely printing more silver certificates) and hence is not subject to the normal budgetary pressures restraining other special interest legislation. But these are only blemishes on an excellent volume which should be useful not only to political scientists, but also to economists, like the reviewer, who are most interested in "political economy" as a means of achieving sound economic policies in government.

JOSEPH E. REEVE.

Bethesda, Maryland.

Melville Weston Fuller; Chief Justice of the United States, 1888–1910. BY WILLARD L. KING. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1950. Pp. x, 394. $5.00.)

The author of this new title in the growing list of judicial biographies is a leading Chicago attorney who has made his subject a long-time hobby. As a labor of love the work happily demonstrates that research into the lives of American judges has by no means resulted in a fixed genre. Mr. King has produced what is primarily a portrait and an appreciation of Illinois' most distinguished representative on the roster of the Supreme Court. He dwells particularly on the engaging warmth of Chief Justice Fuller's personality, his fortitude in meeting personal and professional obstacles, and his skill in preserving the good feeling, if not the doctrinal unity, of a Court which exhibited such dominant temperaments as Miller, Field, Harlan, Bradley, and Gray.

The most striking feature of the book is its wealth of intimate detail, drawn from anecdotes, interviews, and letters, the bulk of the latter newly discovered by the author's attic explorations and reproduced for the first time. No judicial biography excels this one in the revelation of the day-to-day relationships of the members of the Court and the exchange of opinion in the development of decisions, behind what Justice Frankfurter has called "the impenetrable draperies of judicial secrecy." Especially noteworthy is a fresh picture of Justice Holmes, who appears in the forefront of his career, brash, breezy, and full of zeal for work. "I can write almost any old thing that anyone will give me," he informs the Chief. "A case doesn't generally take more than two days if it does that. . . . Why don't you send me a real stinker that will be of some relief to you?" (pp. 291, 319). Fuller's talent for meliorating animosities is indirectly revealed in another note from Holmes. "I will omit 'anomalous.' I half forgot it. I want to speak to you also about any expression that seems to chafe the majority" (p. 314).

Among Fuller's opinions the author gives major attention to the *Pollock* case. It may be doubted, however, that his analysis will settle the elaborate controversy that has centered around it. He believes that Fuller's use of historical evidence to show that traditional usage had held an income tax to be a direct tax is unanswerable, and has no difficulty in following Fuller's arguments which distinguished the several judicial precedents contrary to that view. On the mystery of the "vacillating" Justice, the author reaches an original and ingenious conclusion. He recalls how the Court had originally divided equally, Justice Jackson being absent, as to whether the tax on the income from personal property was valid and as to whether the tax as a whole should be declared void. After the second hearing the decision was five to four against the tax as a whole, although Jackson aligned himself with the minority in support of the tax. Rejecting the obvious implication that someone must have changed his mind, Mr. King argues the proposition that Justice Shiras was one of the four originally in favor of the tax only because "he did not think the Court's conclusion (in which he concurred) that the law was invalid as to income from land made the law void. Apparently his position then was that to hold the entire law void, the tax on the income from personal property should first be annulled. . . . Shiras, instead of vacillating, forced the Court to come to his position" (p. 220). The author's reply to the researches of Professor Corwin and others, which have led to the conclusion that Gray was probably the vacillator, is a letter from Gray to Fuller, dated the day before the first opinion was adopted, indicating that Gray was against the tax from the start. If this interpretation of the complexities of the case is correct, a number of texts on the subject will have to be revised. What scholarship would be saved if the Justices would only part the draperies!

Of the remainder of Fuller's total of eight hundred and forty opinions a score or so are discussed, without, unfortunately, any particular pattern of interpretation emerging. The author seems to have deliberately minimized the relation of his subject to the economic and social forces at work in his period. It is noted that Fuller ceased to be a Democrat in 1890, primarily because of hard money convictions, but his opinion in the *Knight* case, which drew the teeth of the Sherman Act, is ignored. Nor is there any mention of *In re Debs* and the creation of "government by injunction." The use of the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments and of "freedom of contract" receives only passing reference. Yet surely the historical significance of Fuller's Court was that it negotiated through constitutional interpretation the transition from Radical Republicanism to Big Business Republicanism. It is of course true that Fuller, by reason of intellectual modesty, reflected rather than directed this transition. And it is perhaps the recognition of this fact that determines the author's final evaluation, namely, that Fuller's most remarkable abilities were as an executive in managing the business of the Court.

ARNAUD B. LEAVELLE.

Stanford University.

From the Wagner Act to Taft-Hartley; A Study of National Labor Policy and Labor Relations. BY HARRY A. MILLIS AND EMILY CLARK BROWN. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 1950. Pp. x, 724. $8.50.)

In 1945 Dr. Harry Millis, just retired from his post as Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, commenced work upon a study of the developing pressures for change in the national labor policy. In 1947 Dr. Emily Clark Brown commenced her study of the Wagner Act. The passage of the Taft-Hartley Act in 1947 brought about the combining of their efforts upon a joint project of larger scope than either had planned. The result is the present volume, a comprehensive and detailed account of our national labor policy from the passage of the Wagner Act to the present.

It is not often that a sober, carefully documented evaluation of national policy has appeared so hard upon the heels of major changes in the policy itself. There were available to the authors a scant two years of experience under the Taft-Hartley Act out of which to form their judgments as to the consequences of the Act. Certainly their book could not have appeared much earlier and been more than a forecast of events which in the authors' view must surely flow from the Act. Yet these two years have probably provided a sufficient experience under the Act to warrant evaluation. Many of the problems created by the new legislation have not yet assumed their final form, nor is it possible to judge their ultimate effects upon collective bargaining and industrial peace. The legislative requirements of the Act on many points have not become specific in the decisions and policies of the National Labor Relations Board; issues still remain to be tested in the courts; it is too early to say whether the administrative reorganization and division of powers between the Board and the General Counsel have proved so troublesome because the scheme was unsound or because the personalities were incompatible; most important of all it is too early to say what may be the effects of the Act in another phase of the business cycle when, with an increase in unemployment and a decline in profits, employers may feel more disposed to take advantage of some of the provisions of the legislation. But notwithstanding the obvious impossibility of casting a final balance sheet, clear tendencies and probabilities emerge from the experience to date. Some of these are inherent in the language and purposes of the Act. Some can already be evaluated in terms of the problems encountered in administration. Enough is clearly presaged or has already happened to justify fully the judgments which Dr. Brown passes upon the Labor Management Act of 1947.

The plan and conception of the book is simple and straightforward. The period between the passage of the Wagner Act in 1935 (with a possible backward extension to the Norris-La Guardia Act) and the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act in 1947 is taken as an era in the history of national labor policy. It begins with what the authors regard as a declaration of a thoroughly enlightened labor policy, progresses through the implementation of that policy by the National Labor Relations Board in its case decisions and court tests, encounters the growing opposition of articulate employer groups at first without much public support but subsequently with growing, if misinformed, public backing. Successive Congresses introduce more and more legislation designed to amend the Wagner Act and redress the balance of power which was alleged now to favor labor. Prior to the Smith-Connally Act these had all failed of passage. With the passage of the Smith-Connally Act a breach was made in the dike. In 1947 the turbulent and muddy waters of Taft-Hartley poured through.

The point of view of the authors is also clear and straightforward. They believe in the Wagner Act. The defects in the Act they consider to have been minor and easily corrected. They defend the administration of the Act with skill and detailed documentation against the attacks made upon it by its critics. One of the most interesting sections of the book is the examination of the structure of administration within the N.L.R.B., problems of staffing, relationships between the Board and the regional office and between the lawyers and administrators, use of techniques of informal settlement, quasi-judicial determination and formal court review.

The balance sheet cast on the Taft-Hartley Act is adverse but essentially fair. The authors reject the shrill position of the labor movement but even more decisively reject the enthusiastic appraisal of industry spokesmen and their congressional representatives. Some of the provisions are attacked as positively bad, more as unnecessary and disruptive; a few are supported as beneficial. They are quite aware that the Act has not had the disastrous consequences for organized labor that seemed implicit and potential. They are also aware that the final balance sheet has not been cast. There are new privileges and immunities for employers written into the Act of which employers have not been disposed to avail themselves in a period of high profits and full employment.

This is a most comprehensive and useful book, yet it is in some respects disappointing. It is a work of patience, careful in its handling of detail, exhaustive in its treatment, and on the whole judicious. It is not, however, a creative, or insightful work. It may be captious to criticize a product of manifest scholarship on the ground that it is no more than a scholarly work. Yet it is only fair to say that the point of view from which the book is written—a belief that true collective bargaining is the only sure solvent for the problems of labor relations—although still a widely held and respected position, is not entirely adequate to the problem of large-scale organization of modern labor and modern management. There are troublesome problems which are more and more insistently demanding attention—problems involving the relationship of self-determination to national planning, the bureaucratization of the labor movement, collusion between management and labor to determine the economic environment which they may be able jointly to control. These problems lead to the questions of whether major decisions can be left to the motives and interests of those who sit at the bargaining table, and of whether a national labor policy can any longer be founded entirely on the encouragement of voluntary collective bargaining. Where the authors touch these problems they touch them lightly and tangentially and move back to the firmer ground of a reassertion of the faith in collective bargaining, the faith upon which the Wagner Act was built.

Lloyd H. Fisher.

University of California, Berkeley.

The New Society; The Anatomy of Industrial Order. By Peter F. Drucker. (New York: Harper and Brothers. 1950. Pp. ix, 356. $5.00.)

"The world revolution of our time," argues Peter Drucker in this stimulating and provocative volume, " . . . is not Communism, Fascism, . . . or any of the other 'isms' that appear in the headlines. . . . The true revolutionary principle is the idea of mass-production." It finds its institutional expression in large-scale industrial enterprise. "The enterprise cannot and must not be operated in the interest of any one group: stockholders, workers or consumers. . . . " It must be operated "in the interest of society." But how are the interests of society to be defined and who is to define them?

Drucker's vision of "the New Society" bears a more than superficial resemblance to the old. It is management, "the new ruling group of our society," that must serve as the trustee of society's economic resources. But it is management tempered by a sense of responsibility and self-imposed limitations which operate to reserve areas of autonomous decision-making to other parties-in-interest with stakes in the enterprise. The major problem, as Drucker visualizes it, is to create a social and political climate in which managerial initiative can flourish and the productive potentialities of a mass production economy can find full expression. At the same time, he recognizes that the fulfillment of this goal is intimately dependent on the cooperation and understanding of other interests immediately affected by managerial decisions.

In the course of his analysis, Drucker develops an ingenious program to accomplish the objectives which he has set himself. In order to mitigate labor's fear of overproduction, he would give workers a minimum predictable income and employment guarantee. He would provide a profit-sharing fund to be administered by the workers of the enterprise. They would determine the uses to which the fund might be put. He would seek to overcome labor's resentment of high executive salaries by imposing a maximum on all paid salaries. (He suggests a norm of from $25,000 to $35,000.) This, however, would not exclude executive participation in profit-sharing plans, but he would have the executive income derivable from such plans fluctuate with business conditions in the same way that profit-sharing plans for labor fluctuate. He argues that management must learn to accept the trade union as a legitimate institution, and indeed he endorses the union shop as an essential ingredient in fostering trade union security and responsibility. Through such concessions, he hopes to transform the split allegiance of workers between union and enterprise into a twin allegiance to both. Indeed, he would broaden the managerial experience of workers in the enterprise itself, at least in those areas of most immediate concern to them. He would seek to make the enterprise a community in which workers have status as well as function and in which they think of themselves as responsible citizens rather than oppressed subjects. In exchange for these concessions to union security, he would have the unions forego monopolistic restrictions on membership and opposition to the introduction of technological improvements. He would have them accept a ban on strikes endangering the national welfare, on the assumption that when the ban is invoked, it will involve deterrent penalties for management as well as workers.

He would also modify the legal prerogatives of investors in large-scale enterprise by divesting them of ownership rights and limiting their role to that of participating in income, at the discretion of the Board of Directors, and sharing in the assets in the event of the liquidation of the enterprise. Control of the enterprise would be vested in a Board of Directors, to be composed of representatives of management, investors, the plant community, and full-time "management auditors" whose "duty it would be to prepare and enforce policies of management organization and management succession." This scheme is not worked out in any detail; there is no indication as to how the directors would be chosen, nor does the author make clear where in fact control would lie.

Indeed, the way in which this proposal is discussed suggests one of the major criticisms which can be levelled against the volume as a whole. There is a regrettable tendency when the going gets rough and the time for precise statement has come, to retreat into convenient vagueness. This can be illustrated by the way in which the author handles one of the central issues of the book. His primary concern is with industrial expansion. This is an entirely legitimate and even imperative concern, since the expectations of those who are involved in the enterprise system cannot be satisfied without a constant drive for increased productivity. But to express this concern is only to cross the threshold of a host of difficult and complex problems. What does one do with the fruits of increased productivity? On the basis of what criteria does one reconcile the aspirations of competing claimants? What proportion of the resources made available should one allocate for additional capital expansion, what proportion to lower prices to consumers, what proportion to raise real wages for workers, and what proportion should go to investors in the form of profits? Drucker demonstrates that he is aware of the choices involved, but it cannot be said that he carries the analysis much further.

His treatment of the role of government also leaves a good deal to be desired. He expresses an almost Hayekian aversion to governmental interventionism and tends rather uncritically to echo the myths and repeat the shibboleths characteristic of that position. Fear of totalitarianism leads him to personify governmental power in this country in almost monolithic terms. The sureness of touch which he displays in dealing with problems of the enterprise deserts him when he turns to government and public policy. One suspects that more intimate acquaintance with the pluralistic energies which express themselves in the American political and administrative process might induce him to modify some of his judgments and abandon some of his fears.

Drucker's inability to visualize a creative role for government derives from a profound pessimism or scepticism toward political action. Whether justified or not, it provides the impelling motif which leads him to concentrate all his energies on developing a program of self-help centered on the enterprise. This is for him the alternative to the sterile omnipotence of the Leviathan state. One may wish him every good fortune in gaining adherents for his program, while preserving a qualified optimism that (in the event that his campaign is not altogether successful) the parade of horribles which he envisages as the alternative will not turn out to be quite as fearsome as he expects.

MERLE FAINSOD.

Harvard University.

The English Utilitarians. By JOHN PLAMENATZ. (Oxford: Basil Blackwell. New York: Macmillan Co. 1949. Pp. 228. $2.25.)

The English Utilitarians. BY LESLIE STEPHEN. (New York: Peter Smith. 1950. 3 volumes. Pp. viii, 525. $15.00.)

Here are two works on English utilitarianism, one the reprint of an old classic by Leslie Stephen, the other a new study by John Plamenatz of Oxford. In my opinion neither of them equals in breadth or depth the work of the French scholar, Élie Halévy, but that is a very high standard indeed. Both are excellent contributions to one of the most important fields in modern political thought. The quality of Stephen's study is well known, and the work of Plamenatz deserves to stand beside it.

Plamenatz's book is actually an essay of a hundred and sixty pages with a reprint of Mill's *Utilitarianism* appended to it. But it is very carefully written and manages to include sketches of most of the important English utilitarians from Hobbes to John Stuart Mill. Only one omission stands out: there is virtually nothing on John Austin—to whom Stephen, incidentally, devotes a valuable chapter—with the result that the jurisprudential aspects of utilitarianism are left rather vague. This is perhaps doubly unfortunate, because the Austinian theory of law and sovereignty, with its often deceptive rigor of exposition, is just the sort of topic which one feels Mr. Plamenatz could handle very well indeed.

For Plamenatz is at his best when he analyzes the logical structure of utilitarianism, when he matches its conclusions against its assumptions and its assumptions against each other. He has a lucid and original mind, and even when he travels familiar ground, as in his criticism of Bentham's felicific calculus, he usually adds a fresh analytic touch of his own. He is at his weakest when he proceeds to discuss utilitarianism in terms of the actual working of political institutions. For example, he seems to have a special enthusiasm for James Mill's analysis of representation, despite the fact that its simple use of the self-preference principle illustrates vividly the mistakes that utilitarianism made on this score. The younger Mill's discussion of the tyranny of opinion, on the other hand, which the twentieth century is beginning to appreciate even more than the nineteenth century did, Mr. Plamenatz believes has declined in importance. He associates it almost entirely with the question of democracy, and fails to note that it is also an implicit criticism of modern totalitarianism.

One additional word about the new edition of Stephen's *Utilitarians.* It is part of a micro-offset publishing venture undertaken by Peter Smith of New York. Enterprises of this sort are, of course, always valuable, but one cannot help wondering whether a limit ought not to be set on the smallness of the type that is used. The type in this edition is so small that it becomes, after a time, practically unreadable. It seems to me that a long wait for an old copy of Stephen would be well worth enduring in order to avoid the use of this one.

LOUIS HARTZ.

Harvard University.

An Inquiry into the Principles and Policy of the Government of the United States. By JOHN TAYLOR. (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1950. Pp. 562. $7.50.)

It is high time that acknowledged classics of American political thought reappeared in modern dress. It is the ageless quality about such books as this *Inquiry* that makes them classics and gives them peculiar relevance in every period of political change. John Taylor of Caroline, the Virginia farmer, publicist and legislator who has been called the "Philosopher of Jeffersonian Democracy," has been well known to political scientists for a generation, after suffering half a century of neglect. He is better known, however, by references in text books and monographs than by first-hand contact, for only the oldest and largest libraries boast his works. The *Inquiry,* published in 1814, was actually completed in 1811, having been written in desultory fashion over a period of years; hence its emphasis on funding, banking, and other tribulations of Jeffersonian times, and its pointed though belated thrusts at John Adams, whose *Defense of the Constitutions* is its point of departure. It reflects the long struggle between Republicanism and Federalism, between liberty and authority, between the freedom of the individual and the power of government, that had been in progress since the days of the Constitutional Convention.

Taylor, like Jefferson, is concerned with the defense of liberty against tyrants, whether they appear as kings or presidents, or in the guise of parliaments, congresses or courts; but though he uses eighteenth century terms, it is power in the modern sense that he really fears. His analysis of the sources of political power is penetrating, and the reader will see in it the substance of those great debates on sovereignty that were to immortalize the Senates of the 1830's and beyond. Taylor's faith lay in the values of the Enlightenment, and so he propounded a doctrine aimed at the preservation of civil liberties. Ironically enough, his major writings came after his own theory had been turned against his ends. He tells us explicitly here that the Virginia Resolutions, which he introduced and defended in the Legislature after they had come from Madison's pen, were to preserve the liberty of the individual, but the Hartford Convention had already applied the doctrine to the defense of a vested interest. The particular threats to the democratic way of life against which Taylor's fire is directed are those he knew, but they are also perennial threats that every generation must combat in the terms of its own time.

Taylor's mind was devious, and his books are discursive, repetitious, and often tortuously involved. Yet his style, for all its obscurity, sparkles time and again with pithy and robust sentences that cut with scalpel-like cleanness or fall with the devastating power of a sledgehammer. "The struggle for our presidency," he writes, "like the struggle for the English administration, is the concurrent verdict of the contending parties, that executive power has already obtained the ascendancy" (p. 191). In another passage he explains why national debts are created: "Nations are persuaded that they can anticipate the riches of posterity and bequeath to it their misfortunes" (p. 232). To him election is no bar to tyranny. "Marius, Sulla, Pompey, Caesar, Cromwell and Bonaparte were elected" (p. 170). And so in our time were Hitler and Huey Long!

By way of introduction Professor Roy Franklin Nichols has written an excellent essay that serves to place Taylor in proper perspective, both temporally and intellectually. Indeed the whole venture is admirable, and it is to be hoped that this volume will be followed by others. But let the next example be more durably bound and less badly overpriced.

CHARLES M. WILTSE.

Washington D. C.

John Quincy Adams; His Theory and Ideas. BY GEORGE A. LIPSKY. (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell. 1950. Pp. xii, 347. $4.50.)

Here is an intellectual biography that surely deserves the handsome job of publication accorded it. Mr. George A. Lipsky of the University of California has given us a study of John Quincy Adams of which he may be hardly less proud than Professor Bemis must be of his magnificent *John Quincy Adams and the Foundations of American Foreign Policy.* Together these two books herald the revival of our sixth President's undoubted reputation as one of the memorable American thinkers. I envy Mr. Lipsky the writing of this book, not only because it is so patently a labor of love, but also because he has been so proficient in a field of historical writing where entertaining successes are infrequent and dull failures without number.

The most notable feature of *John Quincy Adams* is Adams himself, and his far-ranging, experienced, inquisitive, hard-working, ever-developing mind. Most of us know by heart the fantastic roll-call of Adams' virtues and weaknesses (many of the latter exhibiting astounding virtue!)—independence, courage, doggedness, rectitude, industry, aloofness, introspection, self-confidence, ambition, purity, and all-out integrity—but never until reading this careful study did I realize how intense was the interaction of his mind and morality. Nor did I realize how comprehensive, rich, changing, and prophetic was his more strictly political and constitutional thinking. Two aspects of his political creed are of special interest at the present juncture in our national progress: his contempt for party labels and divisions and thus for the politically adaptable and attractive individual; and his advanced conception of the purpose and role of government, in which he was thoroughly at odds with the thinking of his own generation, and in which his "political views . . . were more akin to Roosevelt's ideas than were Jackson's" (p. 139). As to the first point, we may wonder if there is any place left under our twentieth-century political system for so crusty an independent as John Quincy Adams—never forgetting that under the early nineteenth-century system he was most of his career an *elected* official. As to the second, would Adams be upset, pleased, or indifferent over the attempts of several people, notably Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., to picture him as a sort of John the Baptist of the Welfare State? In any case, it is clear from Mr. Lipsky's presentation that Adams spoke a different, more progressive language than that of the Jacksonians on the efficacy of government and of the politically-organized community.

Several points might be made in criticism of *John Quincy Adams* without weakening the general conclusion that it stands as a notable exercise in political science: (1) like all studies of its kind it has inevitably given too much order to an unordered political philosophy (though how this can be avoided I'm sure I do not know); (2) despite Mr. Lipsky's early assertion that Adams "evolved a conception of life, God, and the universe into which his whole policy and his attitude on all the problems of his political life may be neatly fitted" (p. 4), he leaves the reader to do most of the fitting himself; (3) his conclusion is far too brusque and "inconclusive," and somewhat confusing in its sudden introduction of John Locke as a stick against which to measure Adams' ideas. These, I repeat, are minor criticisms (which Mr. Lipsky could doubtless answer) of a book that establishes its author as a political historian we must hear from again.

CLINTON ROSSITER.

Cornell University.

Freedom, Power and Democratic Planning. BY KARL MANNHEIM. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1950. Pp. xxiv, 384. $5.00.)

Taken by itself, this book is a major addition to the literature of power and democratic socialism. But for those already familiar with Mannheim's earlier works, especially his important *Ideology and Utopia* and *Man and Society in an Age of Reconstruction*, this volume —the first in a series of posthumous publications—is likely to produce mixed reactions. It is brilliant and immensely erudite; it grapples with fundamental issues; it contains penetrating insights and exciting speculations. But it is also repetitive of much that went before; and it is so marred by contradictions and spurious reasoning that it will exasperate both the novice and the disciple.

On the positive side, *Freedom, Power and Democratic Planning* contributes an important chapter to the sociology and ethics of power. Mannheim does not accept the sterile dichotomy between political science and political philosophy; his analysis builds instead on the necessary conjunction of facts and values. Nor does he unduly restrict his analysis to "political" government; rather, in the tradition of Max Weber and Simmel, he grasps the fact that power relationships pervade the whole of society and that the business of the state cannot be separated, though it may be distinguished, from the social and economic order. A meaningful theory of power, in his view, "is less concerned with the abstract question of power or no power than with its actual forms and their social setting. It observes the transmutations of power with structural changes of society; it asks what kind and amount of power goes to different members and agents of society; . . . it detects and condemns abuses of power and cruelty"; and it provides a method of directing power toward desirable goals (p. 45 and *passim*).

In these terms the quest for freedom turns on the intelligent application of power; for men cannot choose between freedom and power, but between alternate forms of power that assure or restrict alternate forms of freedom. To secure freedom for the masses of men, and to use power in the service of the right values, planning is essential. (Mannheim is not entirely clear whether he means *his* values or values democratically determined by society, though he tries throughout to identify the two.) Those who would return to laissez-faire capitalism fail to understand (a) that citizens are not likely to surrender political power exercised by *their* government—which they have elected and can remove—in order to trust to economic power exercised by "oligarchies without public responsibility" (pp. 112–113); and (b) that capitalism cannot be the effective answer to Communism or other forms of dictatorship, since Communism is itself a reply to the failure of capitalism. The answer instead must be a successful non-communist, non-capitalist state, a society built on democratic planning.

In delineating the structural changes that are required to achieve this free and planned society, Mannheim identifies himself, broadly, with the proponents of the mixed economy or welfare state. He points out that power controlled in one sphere—*e.g.*, the political—still leaves the individual exposed to uncontrolled power in other spheres—*e.g.*, the economic, the military, the ideological. But Mannheim's psychological orientation causes him to approach the area of controls from a negative standpoint; he seeks intervention only to prevent major maladjustments, both in the power equilibrium and in the individual personality. However, he would go so far as to attempt the reconstruction of the individual through social manipulation; for in his view the new society requires not only new institutions but new men and new values. This, of course, is a large order, and in its execution Mannheim resorts to a psychology of democratic personality and, ultimately, religion; for this alone, he feels, can provide the spiritual integration necessary to the regeneration of man and society.

Freedom, Power and Democratic Planning is noteworthy not alone for its systematic construction of a power theory but for its challenging observations on a number of incidental yet significant themes, for example, the argument that political obligation in democracy consists chiefly in loyalty not to the law but to the accepted procedure (p. 206); or that competition as the *organizing principle* of the social structure may be replaced by planning without eliminating competition as a *social mechanism* to serve desirable ends (p. 191).

When all this has been said, however, serious shortcomings remain. Mannheim's power analysis does not accommodate his earlier, and still discerning, interpretation of ideology and utopia. If ideology is a rationalization of the interests of the dominant power group, then the stated values or ideals of the totalitarians, say, are simply guises for the retention of power and are not to be taken at face value, as Mannheim here does (pp. 23 ff.). Similarly, if only the pressures of rival forces and cross currents compel power-seeking men and groups to plead in the name of the common good (p. 151), then the emerging conception of the common good is a utopian wish-dream irrelevant to the actual intentions of the contestants. Values become a function rather than a determinant of a group's position in the pyramid of power, and ideals that move men—even the ideal of planning for freedom—become chameleons to power. To avoid a conclusion which undermines a major portion of his book, Mannheim would have to abandon his earlier formulation. But if his original hypothesis is right, or partly right (as this reviewer believes), the relation of power to morals intrudes a disquieting note into Mannheim's thesis.

Mannheim either misunderstands democracy or is willing to abandon it for the sake of his planned society. He acknowledges that because planning requires a unified political will it offers a real threat to democracy, but he proposes to meet this danger by establishing a new integrating agency (outside the general machinery of the representative political system and thus outside the contest for power) to act as a voluntary, nonpartisan, but "supreme tribunal to guarantee consistency and continuity in planning" (pp. 34–35, 166–167). Now it is obvious that if such an agency were to command obedience it would become the focal point of the struggle for power, and would in no wise be motivated by disinterested men. If it were subordinate to the legislature or executive, on the other hand, either it would be manipulated and controlled in the interests of the dominant party or it would be ignored. In any event, the relevance to democracy of such a body is hard to grasp.

Mannheim assumes as an underlying principle of his book "a correlation between social organization and personality pattern" (p. 231). He draws a dichotomy between democratic and authoritarian types of personality and between democratic and authoritarian societies, and argues that only where we have both a democratic social structure and a democratic man can we hope to realize the new society. But Mannheim's excursus on this currently fashionable theme is unconvincing. No society has ever fitted into one or the other of these rigid categories of the psychologist; every society has contained elements of both. Few individuals are in all the facets of their being consistently one or the other; nearly every man exhibits a complex of "democratic" and "authoritarian" behavior traits. Democratic societies produce authoritarian men, and authoritarian societies have been confronted in every age with the demand for equality and freedom. The correlation Mannheim assumes is never demonstrated, and he himself is repeatedly compelled to acknowledge the inconvenient facts. The absurdity of his romantic psychology appears when he argues (pp. 95–97) for a selection of leaders based on "intelligence" tests and character evaluation in the schools, and on the "scientific techniques" used by the American Army in World War II in selecting and assigning men "to all ranks of their armies"!

In a minor vein, the book suffers from numerous contradictions. The general will, for example, both is (p. 156) and is not (p. 151) a mystical unity. In the Soviet Union reward is based on merit (p. 80); but "proved efficiency is not enough; there are criteria of loyalty to the cause and of like-mindedness" (p. 91). "Democracy should admit all views, . . . but it would be suicide to allow antidemocratic propaganda"; however, "totalitarian points of view can be discussed" (pp. 137–138, 140).

A voluminous bibliography is included, as is customary with all of Mannheim's books. This has the virtue of indicating the relevant literature, but it tends also to obscure rather than emphasize the leading items; while the effort to be encyclopedic exposes important omissions. Thus Mannheim seems not to have discovered, or profited from, the books on power written by W. J. Temple, G. W. Thomson, F. M. Watkins, Max Nomad, A. D. Benne, and numerous others.

The foregoing reflections are not designed to minimize the considerable achievements of this work, which serious students of political and sociological theory should read and ponder. The editors—Adolph Lowe, E. K. Bramsted, and Hans Gerth—are to be congratulated for making available some of the remaining fragments of the product of a distinguished mind.

DAVID SPITZ.

Ohio State University.

People or Masses; A Comparative Study in Political Theory. BY SISTER THOMAS ALBERT CORBETT. (Washington, D. C.: Catholic University of America Press. 1950. Pp. xiii, 241. $2.75.)

This volume is a presentation of political theory according to "principles of Christian political humanism" (p. xi). It contrasts the approach to politics which deals with "depersonalized masses" with that which deals with people, in the light of those principles. It regards the distinction between people and masses as the crucial distinction in modern politics, a viewpoint for which there is some evidence. Since the author refers to "*the* Church" (pp. 13, 75, 78, 79, etc.) and contrasts the attitude of "revealed religion" (p. 77) with that of "man-made religion" (p. 76), clearly including Protestantism in the latter category, we may suppose that "Christian political humanism" is exclusively Roman Catholic political humanism. While the book is a Catholic presentation of the distinction between people and masses, and regards religious conviction as preliminary to any sound political doctrine, it lacks the intellectual toughness which many non-Catholics have admired in the best Catholic works on political theory. There can be no quarrel with the author's dislike for the depersonalized mass society and the totalitarian states which represent the ultimate in such a society. There can, however, be considerable quarrel both with her explanation for the *raison d'être* of such a society and with her presentation of alternatives.

To Sister Corbett, the intellectual movement which destroyed the unity of the Middle Ages and foretold the modern world where she finds much moral disintegration, can be summed up in the word "secularist." While the meaning of "secular" in the context of the work is not altogether clear, and seems to include Protestantism, it is perfectly true that modern political thinking contains a large non-Christian strain. To suppose that that strain is the most characteristic teaching of the writers who tried to transform political thinking in precisely the ways Sister Corbett deplores—the separation of science from wisdom, the substitution of a natural claim for a transcendent norm, the concern with the "is" rather than the "ought," and the "atomization" of the political man—is to ignore what they themselves said. To Machiavelli, Bacon, and Hobbes, Scholastic teaching was of secondary importance. They were crossing swords with Plato and Aristotle. They did not consider the chief problem one of secularization but of the substitution of one secular teaching for another. It must be theoretically possible, moreover, for secular teaching to provide a teleological bond, as the Thomistic debt to a secular Aristotle shows. To Sister Corbett, however, that possibility is clearly not a serious one. Nor is the responsibility of secularism in her opinion restricted to the modern political teaching. Many political developments are attributed to it: the "divorce of economics from ethics" (p. 62), the corrosion of the family (p. 80), and the "bitter fruits of absolute sovereignty, imperialism, nationalism and power politics" (p. 209).

In the light of the attribution of broad consequences in modern life to secularization, the liberal temper of the book is rather surprising. Rejecting what seem to her the roots and the trunk of liberalism, Sister Corbett accepts its fruits. Her love for the Middle Ages does not keep her from preferring democracy for a "mature people" (p. 148). Her insistence on duties does not keep her from accepting a doctrine of "natural rights," including property (p. 156). In spite of her dislike for the economic man, she places a high value on "private initiative" (p. 150). And her insistence on cultural conditioning, even her qualified support for progress, are much more in the spirit of historicism than Thomism (pp. 66, 147–48).

It may be quite possible to reconcile modern democracy with pre-modern political teaching, whether pagan or Christian. The problem of whether we do not require such a reconciliation is one of the most serious and formidable problems facing the political science of our own time. We should be grateful to a book which throws light on the subject. Unfortunately the author merely assumes such a reconciliation, an assumption that is not convincing to the searching but unconverted reader. The fundamentally optimistic discussion of the international community is further evidence of the author's readiness to depend on the teaching which she condemns.

It seems to me that if Christian writers want to defend their political principles, they should face frankly the greatest non-Christians, such as the writers of classical antiquity, or Hobbes, or Montesquieu, or, indeed, Shakespeare; or one should not be obliged to accept their defense.

HOWARD B. WHITE.

New School for Social Research.

International Law and Human Rights. By H. Lauterpacht. (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Inc. 1950. Pp. xvi, 475. $8.50.)

We are already deeply indebted to Professor Lauterpacht for his monograph published in 1945, entitled *An International Bill of the Rights of Man,* which contributed so significantly to the work of the Commission on Human Rights of the United Nations. In the present volume the author carries on his studies and gives us an analysis of the legal effects of the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and of the efforts made "to give substance to an idea which must be regarded as inherent in the Charter"; and in order to present this material more effectively the author undertakes to examine what he describes as "the wider background" of the problem of the subjects of international law and the interaction of international law and the law of nature in relation to human rights. This last subject covers some of the ground already covered in the volume published in 1945, now out of print.

Nowhere is the controversial question of the individual as a subject of international law treated more effectively than in the opening section of the volume. A generation ago it was the almost unanimous opinion of writers that individuals were no more than objects of international law, that their rights and duties were such as states might confer upon them by constitutional law, that whatever treaties might be entered into with respect to individuals were strictly agreements between states, from which the individual might derive rights but which he could not claim in his own name. But today, in the presence of the evidence submitted by Professor Lauterpacht and the conclusions which he draws from the evidence, it would be difficult even for the most rigid positivist to continue to adhere to the traditional position. The developments of the last quarter of a century have changed the position of the individual fundamentally, although the change is limited to certain specific fields, the most important of which is that of fundamental human rights. The author stresses the importance of understanding clearly this new position of the individual, so as to make it possible to give "full scope to a crucial purpose of the United Nations."

Part II of the volume gives us an elaborate study of human rights under the Charter of the United Nations. Passing from general observations upon the legal effects of the provisions of the Charter, the author enters upon a detailed analysis of the effect of Article 2(7) of the Charter, denying the right of the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state. Controversial issues arise here at every turn, and it is not necessary to agree upon all points with the author to appreciate the thorough examination he has made of the meaning of the paragraph. Clearly the terms of Article 2(7) were not intended to make the provisions of the Charter in regard to human rights no more than abstract generalities, as would be the case if each state could reject any inquiry by the United Nations into its observance of its obligations as being intervention in matters within its domestic jurisdiction. These chapters should be reread in connection with the author's comments on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights at the close of the volume.

Part III deals with the substance of an international bill of rights and with possible sanctions for its enforcement. Here the author again includes much of the material of his earlier volume. Each separate right is analyzed and its implications indicated; and the successive items of the author's proposed bill bear most interesting comparison with the articles of the Universal Declaration and with those of the proposed Convention.

What scholars owe to Professor Lauterpacht is not only his exacting scholarship, which omits no detail of a problem from careful examination, but his tendency at all times to have recourse to fundamental principles and to interpret treaties liberally in the light of the objectives proclaimed by the parties. If he seems at times to be speaking *de lege ferenda* rather than in terms of present law, he does so because he wishes to emphasize the dynamic character of the law and the urgent necessity of extending it into new fields if it is to meet the needs of the international community. The present volume might be described as an application to the problem of fundamental human rights of the principles of the author's earlier volume, *The Function of Law in the International Community*, which belongs among the most significant contributions of this generation to the science of international law.

C. G. FENWICK.

Pan American Union.

The Occupation of Japan; Second Phase, 1948–50. BY ROBERT A. FEAREY. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1950. Pp. xii, 239. $3.00.)

The characteristic which distinguishes contemporary occupation efforts from all previous military governments is our deliberate attempt to rearrange the weave of the political fabric of occupied nations. In Japan, as in Germany, Austria, and Korea, we have sought this objective in terms of both institutional change and attitudinal reform. While the latter has been our fondest hope we have predicated its accomplishment almost entirely on reshuffling the institutional patterns of Japanese life. This process raises questions especially pertinent in times of vigorous international ideological competition. Can the remolding of institutional life fundamentally change behavior patterns? Are there some institutions (such as family) which are more productive of behavioral changes than others? Whatever the answers to these questions may be, it is a fact that we have shaken up Japanese institutions at least with vigor if not discrimination. The record appears voluminously impressive: women now vote and inherit property, policemen carry clubs instead of swords, governors are popularly elected rather than imperially appointed.

Our success in changing these institutions does not bring with it the confidence that we have produced a really effective reorientation of attitude. We are haunted by historical reminders of the adeptness of the Japanese to maintain past ways of life under cloaks of modernity. No less are we bothered by the proposition that Japanese behavior may be quite different from the agreeableness of the past five years once the restraints of occupation are removed. The words of Professor Kosuke Kimura of Tokyo National (formerly Imperial) University, expressed at a recent public meeting of scholars, are almost ominous: "We must remember that Japan under occupation is not Japan as her true self." Even if we acknowledge that Japan has been nudged rather than pushed into reform, what results will the release from nudging produce?

Robert Fearey, one-time private secretary to Ambassador Grew and more lately concerned with Japanese affairs in the Department of State, has rendered a balance sheet of our efforts in Japan since 1948. This is a supplement (and, one hopes, not a sequel) to the earlier *Allied Occupation of Japan* by Edwin M. Martin, also published under the auspices of the Institute of Pacific Relations. Ambassador Grew's judgment expressed in his preface that this is a book "written with scholarly precision" is easily validated. If one seeks the answers to the questions posed earlier in this review he will be disappointed. But he will find a wealth of analysis and speculation concerning the essence of these questions. Whoever is disappointed by the extent of the analysis given in this book should be invited to compare it with the 1300 page *Political Reorientation of Japan 1945–1948*, recently released by MacArthur's government section. He would then become grateful not only for Fearey's particular undertaking but also for the very existence of the Institute of Pacific Relations and its effort to augment the sterility of official reports with as much critical insight as can be sustained by the cautions of scholarship.

Sounder analysis is possible now as it was not in 1947 when Martin wrote his book. While Fearey's 215 pages of compact survey follow the same structural outline begun in Martin's earlier book, the textual content is quite different. Martin in his shorter book quoted liberally from documents within the text and added a forty-five page appendix for good measure. Of documentary materials in occupation affairs we have had a rich diet; happily Fearey omits documents in the text and reduces his appended materials to sixteen pages.

Fearey's treatment of the last two years of occupation shows notable balance. He is no Indian remedy man disguised as educator yelling that school reform alone will bring democracy to Japan. Here is no plea for panacea. Each aspect of occupation effort receives proportionate attention: land reform, political parties, elections, police reform, decentralization of government, economic reform, peace treaty. The author appears to be aware of the complex interrelationships of any reforming process. Thus when he indicates (pp. 51–52) that the national government has usurped some authority intended for local government, he attributes this to the absence of a tax structure which permits local government to be truly independent of national control. In further analysis he discusses the proposed revisions in tax structure suggested by the Shoup Commission.

Fearey is somewhat confident that democratization in Japan will endure. He bases this confidence on six factors: (1) reforms have built up vested interests of support; (2) reforms have been so drastic that only "national upheaval" could restore the pre-occupation structure; (3) Japan will be dependent upon the United States; (4) Japan admires the military success of the United States; (5) the occupation has been longer than expected and therefore more thorough; (6) Japan has had her eyes opened and is not likely to return to her old ways.

The validity of each of these six factors is open to question, though no other judgment is necessarily better (or worse) than Fearey's. Though vested interests in support of reform may have been more articulate, the vast sub-stratum of Japanese life is intensely proud, nationalistic, and disdainful of Western influence. The importance of Fearey's fourth factor has undoubtedly been diminished by our reverses in Korea. His fifth point is controversial. While the occupation has been longer than planned, it may well have reached the point of diminishing returns in terms of good will and effectiveness. Luman Shafer noted this more than two years ago in a provocative essay in the *Christian Century* in which he cautioned that we "must get out of Japan before it's too late." MacArthur himself has repeatedly said that no occupation accomplishes much after three years and he asked for an end of occupation as early as 1948.

We have no empirically derived data to prove Fearey wrong or right. History helps us little, for never before have we sought to remake a nation of mature and sophisticated level of civilization. Fearey does not make enough of the warning of Professor Kimura: the release of occupation pressure may produce strange results. Yet in terms of Western experience in government, and in terms of criteria laid down by such anthropologists as the late Ruth Benedict, Fearey's optimism is probably justified. We have a right to expect that our relatively gentle treatment of Japan will accomplish genuine reform and win for us firm allies. The unknowns of the social psychology of a people occupied for five years or more in the crucible of power politics in Asia may tragically twist our expectations.

RALPH J. D. BRAIBANTI.

Kenyon College.

BOOK NOTES, NOTICES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

AMERICAN GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

Public Administration. By Herbert A. Simon, Donald W. Smithburg and Victor A. Thompson. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1950. Pp. xv, 582, xviii. $6.00.)

This volume is a major landmark among the textbooks in public administration. It breaks new ground in a measure not matched since the appearance of the pioneer texts by White and Willoughby a quarter-century ago. The strength of *Public Administration* lies in the success with which the authors have created, within the requirements of a general text, a coherent and systematic application to public administration of the newer concepts of administration as a social process. This is the foundation stone upon which the authors build their text. They are concerned with "the patterns of behavior that are common to human cooperation in organizations." They regard their approach as "a realistic, behavioral description of the processes of administration," and believe that "a clear understanding of the problems of top-level organization and of the relation of administration to politics can be reached only through an analysis of the basic psychological processes involved in administration." To this difficult and pioneering task the authors have applied themselves with enthusiasm and insight, skillfully employing the conceptual tools of sociology and psychology and using intelligently and imaginatively their own experiences in public administration. The result is a more nearly complete view of public administration than other texts provide, and a new emphasis (somewhat paradoxical in view of the authors' devotion to a science of administration) upon the large involvement of public administration in social values. The text has many assets: it consistently aims at describing accurately what goes on in the real world of administration; it looks steadily at the administrative process from the perspective of the nonsupervisory member of the organization, in useful contrast to the more familiar view of the manager; it boldly substitutes new concepts for certain traditional ones which the authors regard as obsolescent; it succeeds in conveying abstract ideas to students through concrete pictures of how people behave in organizations; it presents, in sum total, a convincing exposition of administration as a study in social psychology. In such a rapidly evolving and increasingly complex field as public administration, no general text can escape some imperfections. Some readers of this volume will doubt that the abandonment of familiar terms of exposition, such as the division of work by purpose, process, place or clientele, or such familiar concepts as "line" and "staff," is justified by the usefulness of the new terms introduced; the authors would no doubt reply that nothing less than new terminology would suffice to carry the new meanings they feel must be communicated to their readers. Whatever the merits of that exchange may be, to this reviewer the main shortcoming of the text is that, in looking at public administration, the authors give their attention so intensively to the noun *administration* that the adjective *public* is not underscored. Thus the second major theme in the recent literature of public administration—the consideration of its basic involvement in the political process—is subordinated. While the universal characteristics of administration are discussed, for the most part, in the vocabulary and in the environmental terms of governmental organizations, the stress is rarely upon the unique political setting of public administration. The authors are not unmindful of the significance of this environment; but, in their view, the purpose and the content of the governmental programs, the constitutional status of public administration, its relation to the party process, its response to more general political forces, the problems of responsibility surrounding the structure and composition of the bureaucracy, and many other related issues, are best understood when seen from the perspectives of social psychology. Their effort to demonstrate this thesis is genuinely impressive, but most political scientists will continue to wish for a text which presents the virtues of this volume within a greater emphasis upon the constitutional and political environment of public administration.—WALLACE S. SAYRE, *City College of New York.*

Pressures on Congress; A Study of the Repeal of Chinese Exclusion. BY FRED W. RIGGS. (New York: King's Crown Press, Columbia University. 1950. Pp. xv, 260. $3.75.)

The past few years have seen a revival of interest in the process of legislation. Stemming partly from the campaign for legislative reorganization at the congressional level, this interest and effort have spilled over into other areas, and have had as one of their consequences the appearance of a number of case studies of the enactment of particular statutes. As indicated by the sub-title, the present volume is a study of the legislative campaign to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Acts. The legislative history of the effort to repeal these discriminatory laws is confined to the year 1943 in which the successful outcome of the campaign to attain that goal of repeal was placed chronologically. The approach and technique of the case study can be loosely characterized as that of "the slice of legislative life." This is a most fruitful method of analysis in terms of legislative phenomena, and in the hands of the author of this work has been well managed, even if the lack of highly dramatic maneuver or bitter debate over his selected subject tends to give to his canvas a somewhat subdued palette. *Pressures on Congress* is divided into five large parts within which there are nineteen sub-sections or chapters. A review of our Chinese Exclusion Policy is first presented in conjunction with the developments which tended to make repeal an attainable policy. Consideration is given to popular pressures for such action, to administrative pressures tending towards the same goal, and to congressional pressures working for or against the repeal of the extant (1943) Chinese Exclusion Acts. By far the most interesting and suggestive portion of the book is contained in the last sub-section which is wholly devoted to an analysis of the dynamics of the legislative process. Here the author makes some telling points while interrelating the pressure group process to the administrative responsibilities for legislative policy and to the formal procedures of actual legislation. Writing temperately, with comprehensive control of his material, the author has performed his task well. The failure of the volume to rise to impressive heights of legislative and oratorical controversy is in no sense the fault of the author; it is, as so well admitted by the latter, indicative of the degree of acceptance or indifference to the outcome of any struggle for repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Acts. —CHARLES W. SHULL, *Wayne University.*

Intergovernmental Relations in the U. S. As Observed in the State of Minnesota. EDITED BY WILLIAM ANDERSON AND EDWARD W. WEIDNER. (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.) I—*Intergovernmental Relations and the Courts.* BY FORREST TALBOTT. (1950. Pp. xi, 148. $3.00); II—*Intergovernmental Relations in Highways.* BY R. A. GOMEZ. (1950. Pp. vii, 123. $2.50.); and III—*Intergovernmental Relations in Education.* BY ROBERT L. MORLAN. (1950. Pp. xi, 220. $3.50.)

Is centralization real? What is the meaning of "cooperation and harmonious relations" in federal relationships? Of what significance are functional patterns of relationships *vis a vis* general administration? Does the "state" desire federal aid, or are there statewide interests whose total effect through diverse areas produces a general demand for national support of certain services? What does national control mean? Is it merely an accounting of program activity or the planning of programs, or both? What do present trends hold for the future of federalism? These are some of the questions of major concern to Professors William Anderson and Edward Weidner and their staff in their comprehensive survey of Minnesota's intergovernmental relations. Some tentative answers and conclusions are found in the first three of a series of ten monographs; for more conclusive findings we shall have to await the publication of the monographs on public health, social welfare, employment security, agriculture, and fiscal relations, and particularly the last two in the series: the ninth on *Minnesota and Its Local Governments* by Edward W. Weidner and staff, and the final one entitled *Minnesota and the Nation* by William Anderson and staff. As to the first three monographs, the authors amply meet the requirements set forth by Anderson and Weidner in their introduction to the first study: "Our general approach instead of being primarily historical, constitutional, and political has been largely contemporary, administrative, fiscal, and as far as possible human. . . . To a considerable extent our studies must be descriptive of existing governmental institutions, procedures, and functions. . . . To the specialist in each field we wish to say that the several authors have not attempted to describe or evaluate the function as a whole or in all its ramifications. . . . The theme or connecting thread is simply that of intergovernmental relations. . . ." These first three studies, however, are more than descriptive. Tentative conclusions are drawn. For example, it is found that federal-state-local programs, initiated in conflict, generally become cooperative undertakings as experience, mediation, and compromise gain momentum. The fiscal and non-fiscal aspects are not always easily separable; in the field of highways, for example, each level of government is eager to reduce its financial burden by donating a part of its road program to higher levels; in the educational field, this trend is offset by traditional wariness of a national board of educators. In the courts study, Mr. Talbott tentatively concludes: "If either the national or state governments lost control of their own courts of original jurisdiction, they would no longer be complete governments in the sense that Hamilton and Madison had in mind." The appearance of these monographs serves to increase general interest in the problems of intergovernmental relations; students will welcome additions to this series of "working papers," as well as the more definitive results that will appear in the final studies of Anderson and Weidner.—JOSEPH E. MCLEAN, *Princeton University.*

Hugo L. Black; A Study in the Judicial Process. BY CHARLOTTE WILLIAMS. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1950. Pp. vii, 208. $3.50.)

In this volume the author traces the career of her subject from judge of the police court of Birmingham, Alabama, to Associate Justice of the Supreme Court. Beginning her book with two chapters devoted to an account of Black's appointment to the Court and the sound and fury resulting from the disclosure of his former Ku Klux Klan membership, Miss Williams devotes the two following chapters to Black's career in the Senate with special emphasis upon his role as inquisitor in the investigations of air mail contracts and public utility holding company lobbies. The remaining one hundred and twenty-two pages of text of the total of one hundred and ninety are devoted to Justice Black's role in the shaping of American constitutional law from 1937 through the 1949–1950 term of court. Although the writer presents a most readable account of the position Justice Black has taken on such matters as state and national power, the Bill of Rights, and constitutional limitations generally, she has not undertaken an extensive analysis of Justice Black's opinions, the doctrinal assumptions underlying them, or the manner in which the Justice reads or misreads history to buttress some of his more important contentions as exemplified by his repeated insistence that the Fourteenth Amendment incorporates the guarantees of the First Amendment. Except for her disapproval of Justice Black's attitude on searches and seizures, his opinions in some of the cases arising out of World War II, and his "uncompromising and aggressive promotion of causes which enlist his sympathy," Miss Williams' treatment of Justice Black is most sympathetic and is executed in a manner that will perhaps be of more interest to general readers of books on politics and government than of value to students of constitutional law. It is therefore no disparagement of this volume to state that it is not and quite properly does not pretend to be an exhaustive treatment of one of the more controversial political and judicial figures of our national history.—ROBERT J. HARRIS, *Louisiana State University.*

The New Nation; A History of the United States during the Confederation, 1781–1789. BY MERRILL JENSEN. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1950. Pp. xviii, 433, xi. $5.00.)

Professor Jensen, author of an important earlier book entitled *The Articles of*

Confederation, has here attempted a definitive account of the government of the United States prior to the adoption of our "present" Constitution, that is, of government during what has come to be called the "critical period." He challenges the position taken in John Fiske's *The Critical Period of American History*—written, according to Charles A. Beard, "without fear and without research"—that throughout most of the 1780's the country was in a state of chaos and depression for want of a strong central government. By digesting a tremendous amount of source materials Jensen reaches the conclusion that, although the country suffered the inevitable disturbances of a postwar period and other ills necessarily connected with the establishment of a new nation, the conditions were not such as obviously to discredit the existing government. The period was one of struggle between two political factions, and its history was written from the point of view of the victor. "Throughout the Confederation men with rival goals pushed two programs simultaneously. The federalists tried to strengthen the Articles of Confederation; the nationalists tried to create a new constitution by means of a convention, and thus avoid the method of change prescribed by the Articles of Confederation. The movement to strengthen the Articles failed on the verge of success; the movement to call a convention succeeded on the verge of failure" (p. 428). In requiring us to reconsider and redigest the materials of the Confederation period the book meets an important need, particularly in the light of the recent tendency to consider the problems of world government in terms of the early experience of the United States. The study will have value whether or not historians generally accept in its entirety the author's revised conception of the "critical period."—CARL BRENT SWISHER, *Johns Hopkins University*.

The Know-Nothing Party in the South. BY W. DARRELL OVERDYKE. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press. 1950. Pp. ix, 322. $4.00.)

Dr. Overdyke has produced the leading study of the American or Know-Nothing party. Meticulous and sometimes vivid details are reported about the party in the South on the basis of extensive examination of newspapers and other often-inaccessible sources. At the same time useful but better known materials are included about the party nationally, particularly with reference to the campaign of 1856. In his final paragraphs the author presents the interesting view that the party was truly national rather than sectional and that it failed partly because it was active "in a period when only sectional issues could hold mass allegiance." The book suffers from prosaic style and from disjointed organization within chapters.—FRANKLIN L. BURDETTE, *University of Maryland.*

County Government Across the Nation. EDITED BY PAUL W. WAGER. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. 1950. Pp. xiii, 817. $7.50.)

Nearly half a century ago, Gilbertson described the county as "the dark continent of American politics." This characterization has tended to be true in the years since, despite the vital importance of the county as a "bulwark of

American democracy." Much less work has been done in this area than on any other equally important phase of the governmental system of the United States. Students will, therefore, be deeply indebted to Professor Wager, and to the Institute for Research in Social Science at the University of North Carolina, for making available this valuable symposium covering selected units in the forty-eight states, plus general comments by the editor on the characteristics of county government in each of four regional groupings—New England states, Eastern and North-Central states, Southern states, and Western states. Fifteen of the fifty-three chapters were prepared by the editor, nine by Emmett G. Asseff. The remaining twenty-nine chapters were prepared by professors of political science and government officials, many of whom were at one time students of the editor. The procedure followed has obviously both advantages and disadvantages. By including units in each of the forty-eight states, a comprehensive coverage is provided, but since the local governmental practices in many adjoining and adjacent states are similar, it necessarily makes for some repetition. On the other hand, it is difficult to select so-called typical counties in many jurisdictions in which the numerous counties vary widely in population, wealth, size, influence, and importance. Pennsylvania, for instance, has sixty-seven counties which vary all the way from Philadelphia and Alleghany with their teeming millions to Forest County with its population of 5,000 or 6,000. Bucks County, which has been selected for analysis, is in many respects a county somewhat unique, not only in Pennsylvania but elsewhere. Taken across the country, however, the samples selected probably represent a fairly good cross-section of the more than 3,000 counties as a whole. The pattern of treatment is fairly uniform. The fifty-three chapters have an average of about fifteen pages apiece. There is an opening general statement on the area, population, and other characteristics of the counties of the state. The individual county studies cover general organization, i.e., county board, elective officers, appointive officers, such functions of county government as highways, health and welfare, and education, and end with a consideration of budgetary and financial problems. In the New England states, where the county is relatively unimportant, individual towns have been selected, and in some other states as well, attention is given to town or township government. In short, this volume provides between the covers of one book a tremendous store of specific information on local government in the United States. This information, nowhere else available in such convenient form, should be of tremendous value to students and teachers of American local government. Much has been written and spoken on the importance of local government in a democracy; here is local government in this country, as close to reality as is possible on the printed page.—W. BROOKE GRAVES, *Library of Congress.*

Police Administration. BY O. W. WILSON. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. 1950. Pp. x, 540. $6.00.)

Dean Wilson's *Police Administration* is a painstaking analysis of police organization and management procedures. Its twenty-six chapters deal with what the author deems to be the most successful practices in directing police service. Hence, the book is aimed exclusively towards police administrators, who will find its pages well packed with worth-while suggestions and with carefully compiled reasons for and against the less obvious proposals. Dean Wilson's experience as policeman and police administrator admirably qualifies him for the task he has assumed, and if frequent revision can be effected in order to keep abreast of changing techniques, a major addition will be made to the basis of police thought and action. For the general student of public administration the book will have a more limited value, although all of the first chapter, and selected other portions invite the attention of those who seek a better understanding of the American police problem in its many aspects and phases. Teachers of government and public administration will find a wealth of illustrative material bearing upon the administrative process, while those whose interest runs particularly to the theory and application of structural organization will want to take special note of the sixty pages devoted to this abiding problem in police management.—BRUCE SMITH, *Institute of Public Administration.*

America's New Frontier; The Mountain West. BY MORRIS E. GARNSEY. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1950. Pp. xviii, 314, ix. $3.50.)

From the standpoint of regional study the Rocky Mountain states of Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Nevada, Utah, Colorado, Arizona, and New Mexico constitute a neglected area despite the fact that substantial governmental programs, particularly water and land use developments, have been carried on within their boundaries. Parts of the region have been incorporated into valley plans of the Columbia, Missouri, and Colorado River basins, with the result that insufficient attention has been given to the area as a region unto itself. Though this book heartily endorses regional developments along drainage basin lines, it emphasizes that on the basis of both physical and economic characteristics the Rocky Mountain states have an identity that cannot be ignored. In brief, Garnsey's thesis is that the Rocky Mountain region is one of the nation's most underdeveloped areas, long discriminated against by industry and capital of other regions. Yet on the basis of both natural and human resources it is richly endowed and in a position to make a far greater contribution to the nation's economy than it now does. The program for economic advancement postulated in the final chapter centers around three major objectives: the promotion of industrial expansion and diversification to offset what is now an overemphasis upon an agricultural and mining economy; the decentralization of economic control to reduce the powers of absentee ownership and to insure the flow of capital into developments which are most beneficial to the region's interests; and finally, the planning and adoption of programs leading to the wise conservation and utilization of natural resources, not only for the purpose of protecting the region's resource base, but to give it in an era of vast exploitation of natural resources more prominence where national considerations are involved. To carry out this program much of the impetus will have to come from the federal government which owns approximately fifty-four percent of the land and which controls vast economic and resource holdings within the region. However, the people of the area can offset federal domination and carry out many programs on a local basis by strengthening their state governments, by promoting non-governmental associations, and by entering into regional arrangements with other states. As the author acknowledges in the preface, his analysis will not appeal to all sections or groups even in the West. He maintains that the silver, sheep, cattle, and beet sugar interest blocs have been motivated primarily by narrow sectional points of view; he attacks the railroads and their discriminating freight rate structure and the basing-point pricing systems; he opposes Southern California's claims to Colorado River water, and leaves no doubt that the battle between the Bureau of Reclamation and Corps of Engineers is an unhealthy one from the standpoint of western interests. Though an economist by profession, he has not hesitated to explore other pertinent political and sociological problems. As a nation we have not yet satisfactorily examined the extent to which respective regions of this country should develop along autonomous lines or, instead, as specialized areas in an overall complementary system. Before we embark upon some of the expensive projects that are being proposed for the Rocky Mountain West, or for other regions, this is a problem which must be squarely faced. To this much-needed evaluation the contributions of this book will be significant.—ERNEST A. ENGELBERT, *University of California, Los Angeles.*

The American As Reformer. By ARTHUR M. SCHLESINGER. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1950. Pp. xi, 127. $2.25.)

The three lectures that make up this volume are designed to reveal the essential continuity of the reform impulse in American history. "Reforms" are treated as being initially moral and religious in content, achieving political expression only after they have become popular movements. Little attention is given to the economic side of social change.

A Journal of the McKinley Years. By CHARLES G. DAWES, EDITED WITH A FOREWORD BY BASCOM N. TIMMONS. (Chicago: Lakeside Press, R. R. Donnelley & Sons Company. 1950. Pp. xxiv, 458. $3.00.)

Dawes' diary, 1893–1913. Entries relating to the campaign of 1896, and to the period of McKinley's administration, during which Dawes was Comptroller of the Currency and an intimate adviser of the President, take up half of the book.

Aspects of American Government. EDITED BY SIDNEY D. BAILEY WITH A FOREWORD BY STEPHEN KING-HALL. (London: The Hansard Society. 1950. Pp. vi, 201. $.85.)

Publication in book form of a selection of the articles on American government which appeared in the special 1949 issue of *Parliamentary Affairs*, reviewed in the September issue of this journal.

Cases on Constitutional Law. By NOEL T. DOWLING. (Brooklyn: Foundation Press, Inc. 1950. Pp. xxxv, 1273. $8.50.)

Fourth edition (third edition 1946). In addition to bringing the material up to date, this revision gives increased attention to several topics, notably the powers of the President, the war powers of Congress, national protection of civil rights, and interstate relations. A new feature is a seventy-page discussion of the origin of the doctrine of judicial review, contributed by John M. Kernochan.

Your Rugged Constitution; How America's House of Freedom is Planned and Built. BY BRUCE ALLYN FINDLAY AND ESTHER BLAIR FINDLAY. (Stanford: Stanford University Press. 1950. Pp. 281. $3.00.)

An effort to rescue the Constitution of the United States from "scholarly oblivion." It presents the Constitution clause by clause with discussions in large type and with plentiful drawings.

The Public Library in the United States; The General Report of the Public Library Inquiry. BY ROBERT D. LEIGH. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1950. Pp. xi, 272. $3.75.)

The summary and interpretation of the total findings of the Public Library Inquiry of the Social Science Research Council by the director of the study. In addition to this summary volume, six special studies have been published and several other reports are available in mimeograph form. Probably the two special reports of most interest to political scientists are the *Public Library in the Political Process* by Oliver Garceau and *Government Publications for the Citizen* by James L. McCamy, reviewed in the June issue of this journal.

Election Laws of the Forty-Eight States; How to Register and Vote. BY BERTRAM M. BERNARD. (New York: Oceana Publications. 1950. Pp. 96. Cloth, $2.00; paper $1.00.)

Generalized chapters written by a member of the New York bar and followed by tabulations of state requirements concerning residence, literacy, poll taxes, disfranchisement for crime, registration, voting hours, and absentee ballots.

The Patronage System in Oklahoma. BY H. O. WALDBY. (Norman, Oklahoma: Transcript Company. 1950. Pp. 100. $1.00.)

State personnel practices under a spoils system, described by an assistant professor of government at the University of Oklahoma.

Property Assessment in Kansas; A Study in Kansas Administrative History. BY JACK F. MCKAY. (Lawrence: University of Kansas, Bureau of Government Research. 1950. Pp. 124.)

A study of the development of organization for the administration of property taxation in Kansas and an analysis of the advantages and difficulties of present assessment methods and procedures. The author is senior analyst in the Bureau of Government Research, University of Kansas.

Missouri; Its Resources, People and Institutions. EDITED BY NOEL P. GIST, THOMAS C. MORELOCK, CLARENCE M. TUCKER AND W. FRANCIS ENGLISH. (Columbia: Curators of the University of Missouri. 1950. Pp. 605.)

A cooperative inventory of the State's natural and human resources prepared by specialists at the University divisions at Columbia and the University School of Mines and Metallurgy at Rolla. Includes chapters on government, law enforcement agencies, and courts and administrative tribunals.

State Personnel Administration in South Carolina. By Raymond Uhl. (Columbia: University of South Carolina. 1950. Pp. 85.)

A summary of the experiences in the twenty-three states operating under state-wide merit systems, followed by descriptions of the separate departmental merit systems in operation in South Carolina.

Municipal Government in South Carolina. By George R. Sherrill and Robert H. Stoudemire. (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press. 1950. Pp. 223.)

Analysis and summary of the main features of municipal government and administration in South Carolina, based primarily on data collected during 1948 for ninety municipalities. The final chapter contains twenty-one conclusions and recommendations. A University of South Carolina Bureau of Public Administration Study.

The Planning Function in Urban Government. By Robert Averill Walker. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1950. Pp. xxi, 410. $4.75.)

A second and expanded edition of a work first published in 1941, especially valuable to political scientists.

On the City Council. By Arthur W. Bromage. (Ann. Arbor: George Wahr Publishing Company. 1950. Pp. v, 81. Lithoprinted. $1.00.)

A Michigan professor's reflections on his experiences as a municipal alderman.

The Pittsburgh Manual; A Guide to the Government of the City of Pittsburgh. By William G. Willis. (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press. 1950. Pp. xxx, 188. Paper, $1.50; bound, $2.50.)

A University of Pittsburgh professor presents a study of the city's government, with charts, pictures, and maps.

The American Cigarette Industry; A Study in Economic Analysis and Public Policy. By Richard B. Tennant. (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1950. Pp. xxvi, 411. $5.00.)

Survey of the industry's history and detailed analysis of its structure and behavior, by Yale economist. Includes a brief discussion of the application of the antitrust laws to the industry.

The Rural Economy of New England; A Regional Study. By John Donald Black. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1950. Pp. xxiv, 796. $7.50.)

A Harvard professor of economics analyzes the New England economy, with emphasis upon agriculture. The book represents a group study supported by the Committee on Research in the Social Sciences and the Harvard Graduate School of Public Administration.

The Railroad Monopoly; An Instrument of Banker Control of the American Economy. By John G. Shott. (Washington, D. C.: Public Affairs Institute. 1950. Pp. xi, 250. $3.00.)

The author's point of view is well reflected in an old English epigram printed opposite the title page:

The law is hard on man or woman
Who steals a goose from off the common,
But turns the larger rascal loose
Who steals the common from the goose.

Radio and Television; An Introduction. By Giraud Chester and Garnet R. Garrison. (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc. 1950. Pp. xv, 550. $4.75.)

Text for speech courses written by members of the faculties of Queens College and the University of Michigan. The first of three parts, devoted to "Radio and Television in Society," is of interest to political scientists.

ARTICLES AND DOCUMENTS ON

AMERICAN GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

J. ALTON BURDINE AND EMMETTE S. REDFORD
University of Texas

ARTICLES

National Government

Frey, Donald S. Maintaining Democratic Processes During Wartime. *Virginia Law Review.* October, 1950.

Mason, Alpheus Thomas. Our Federal Union Reconsidered. *Political Science Quarterly.* December, 1950.

Willcox, Walter F. The Apportionment Problem and the Size of the House: A Return to Webster. *Cornell Law Quarterly.* Winter, 1950.

State Government

Bowen, Don L. They All Get into the Show. *National Municipal Review.* October, 1950.

Diehl, John and Minkin, Noah. A Retirement System for Judges and Justices in Wisconsin. *Wisconsin Law Review.* July, 1950.

Heer, Clarence. State Fiscal Policy for Rearmament. *State Government.* October, 1950.

Kammerer, Gladys. Kentucky's Legislature under the Spotlight. *Kentucky Law Journal.* November, 1950.

Roberts, Harold S. Sound Prelude to Statehood. *National Muncipal Review.* September, 1950.

Schumacher, Waldo. Reapportionment in Oregon. *Western Political Quarterly.* September, 1950.

Shafroth, Will. Judicial Statistics. *Wisconsin Law Review.* July, 1950.

Sunderland, Edson R. Problems Connected With the Operation of a State Court System. *Wisconsin Law Review.* July, 1950.

Wells, Richard H. New York: The Poor Man's Reno. *Cornell Law Quarterly.* Winter, 1950.

Local Government

Benton, W. E. The County Home Rule Movement in Texas. *Southwestern Social Science Quarterly.* September, 1950.

Gulick, Luther. Future of An Oversize City. *National Municipal Review.* July, 1950.

Union Labor and the Municipal Employer. *Illinois Law Review.* July-August, 1950.

Virtue, Maxine Boord. Operative Relationships among Various Courts, Law Enforcement and Welfare Agencies in the City of Detroit. *Michigan Law Review.* November, 1950.

Winter, William O. Kansas City Leaps a River. *National Municipal Review.* October, 1950.

Intergovernmental Relations

Bigge, George E. Federal Grants-In-Aid: A Bulwark of State Governments. *Social Security Bulletin.* November, 1950.

Dunbar, Leslie. Interstate Compacts and Congressional Consent. *Virginia Law Review* October, 1950.

Egger, Rowland. In One Consent. *Public Administration Review.* Autumn, 1950.

Symposium on Civil Defense. *State Government.* November, 1950.

Constitutional Law

Black, Hugo L.; Vinson, Fred M.; Brant, Irving; Wirtz, W. Willard; Brudney, Victor and Wolfson, Richard F.; Nathanson, Nathaniel L.; Harper, Fowler; Abel, Albert; Mann, Howard. A Symposium to the Memory of Wiley B. Rutledge. *Iowa Law Review.* Summer, 1950.

Constitutionality of Fair Trade Pricing Re-Examined. *Illinois Law Review.* July-August, 1950.

Cushman, Robert Fairchild. Public Support of Religious Education in American Constitutional Law. *Illinois Law Review.* July-August, 1950.

Dumbauld, Edward. Judicial Review of Popular Sovereignty. *University of Pennsylvania Law Review.* November, 1950.

Fraenkel, Osmond K. Peaceful Picketing—Constitutionally Protected? *University of Pennsylvania Law Review.* October, 1950.

Frank, John P. The United States Supreme Court: 1949–50. *University of Chicago Law Review.* Autumn, 1950.

Fraser, George B., Jr. Some Problems in Federal Question Jurisdiction. *Michigan Law Review.* November, 1950.

Freedman, Warren. Presidential Timber: Foreign-Born Children of American Parents. *Cornell Law Quarterly.* Winter, 1950.

Grant, J. A. C. Judicial Control of the Legislative Process: The Federal Rule. *Western Political Quarterly.* September, 1950.

Gilkey, Royal C. Justice Frankfurter and Labor's Constitutional Rights. *Labor Law Journal.* September, 1950.

Reese, Willis L. M. The Status in this Country of Judgments Rendered Abroad. *Columbia Law Review.* June, 1950.

Public Administration and Administrative Law

Applicability of the Doctrine of Res Judicata to Determinations by Federal Agencies. *New York University Law Review.* July, 1950.

Ascher, Charles S. Trends of a Decade in Administrative Practices. *Public Administration Review.* Autumn, 1950.

Chatters, Carl H. The Spread of Public Employee Retirement Plans. *Virginia Municipal Review.* September, 1950.

Epstein, Leon D. Political Sterilization of Civil Servants: The United States and Great Britain. *Public Administration Review.* Autumn, 1950.

Ford, Joseph. Administrative Removal of Public Officers. *Boston University Law Review.* November, 1950.

McCarron, Pat. Three Years of the Administrative Procedure Act—A Study in Legislation. *Georgetown Law Journal.* May, 1950.

Mitchell, James M. Recent Progress in Federal Personnel Administration. *Public Personnel Review.* October, 1950.

Steinbicker, Paul G. The Commissioner's Role in Public Personnel Administration. *Public Personnel Review.* October, 1950.

Stewart, Donald D. The Selective Service Appeal Board. *Southwestern Social Science Quarterly.* June, 1950.

Stromsem, Karl E. and Dreese, Mitchell. Attitudes of NIPA Interns Toward a Career in the Federal Service. *Public Administration Review.* Autumn, 1950.

Wengert, E. S. Rethinking the Personnel Mission. *Public Personnel Review.* October, 1950.

Willis, William J. The Right to Judicial Review of an Administrative Finding on the Fact of Citizenship in Exclusion Cases. *Wisconsin Law Review.* July, 1950.

Political Parties, Elections and Public Opinion

Bean, Louis H. The Meaning of the Elections. *New Republic.* November 6, 1950.

Hooker, Richard. The Changing Role of the Newspaper. *Yale Review.* Autumn, 1950.

Murray, Keith. Issues and Personalities of Pacific Northwest Politics, 1889–1950. *Pacific Northwest Quarterly.* July, 1950.

Economic Affairs

National Economy

Buchanan, James. Federalism and Fiscal Equity. *American Economic Review.* September, 1950.

Deyrup, Felicia J. Government Support of Industry in American History. *Social Research.* September, 1950.

Field, Richard H. Economic Stabilization Under the Defense Production Act of 1950. *Harvard Law Review.* November, 1950.

McAllister, B. P. The Big Case: Procedural Problems in Antitrust Litigation. *Harvard Law Review.* November, 1950.

Schachtman, Samuel. Resale Price Maintenance and the Fair Trade Laws. *University of Pittsburgh Law Review.* Summer, 1950.

Tupper, Ernest A. Guideposts to Industrial Mobilization. *Harvard Business Review.* November, 1950.

Warner, Harry P. Unfair Competition and the Protection of Radio and Television Programs, I. *Washington Law Quarterly.* June, 1950.

Labor

Burstein, Herbert. Federal Regulation of Hours and Wages. *Chicago-Kent Law Review.* March, 1950.

Dunau, Bernard. Employee Participation in the Grievance Aspect of Collective Bargaining. *Columbia Law Review.* June, 1950.

Government Regulation

Dunbar, Paul B. The Evolution of Regulatory Policies. *Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Law Journal.* October, 1950.

George, John J. Supreme Court Views Federal Authorization and Merging of Motor Carriers. *Land Economics.* August, 1950.

Gilbert, Howard N. Newspaper-Radio Joint Ownership: Unblest Be the Tie That Binds. *Yale Law Journal.* June, 1950.

Kramer, Robert; Donovan, James B.; Kulp, C. A.; Moser, Henry S.; Marryott, Franklin J.; Andres, Frederick U.; Butler, Charles P.; Pedoe, Arthur; Harrington, Charles F. J.; Brook, Herbert C. Symposium on Regulation of Insurance. *Law and Contemporary Problems.* Autumn, 1950.

Nelson, James C. Patterns of Competition and Monopoly in Present-day Transportation and Implications for Public Policy. *Land Economics.* August, 1950.

Old Standards in New Context: A Comparative Analysis of FCC Regulation. *University of Chicago Law Review.* Autumn, 1950.

Rent Control in the Empire State. *Columbia Law Review.* November, 1950.

Sweeney, Edward C. Safety Regulations and Accident Investigation: Jurisdictional Conflicts of C.A.B. and C.A.A. *Journal of Air Law and Commerce.* Spring and Summer, 1950.

Willis, John W. Some Oddities in the Law of Rent Control. *University of Pittsburgh Law Review.* Summer, 1950.

Resources Development

Desky, Robert M. The Kings River Controversy. *California Law Review.* October, 1950.

Harding, S. T.; Treadwell, Edward F.; Graham, Leland O.; Kuder, William B.; Abel, Edson; Maass, Arthur A. Symposium on The Central Valley Project and Related Problems. *California Law Review.* October, 1950.

Kelly, Desmond G. California and the Colorado River. *California Law Review.* October, 1950.

Civil Liberties

Helsell, Frank P. The Law Against Discrimination in Employment. *Washington Law Review.* August, 1950.

Reynard, Charles A. Freedom from Unreasonable Search and Seizure—A Second Class Constitutional Right? *Indiana Law Journal.* Spring, 1950.

Rifkind, Simon H. When the Press Collides with Justice. *Journal of the American Judicature Society.* August, 1950.

Rockwell, Leo L. Academic Freedom—German Origin and American Development. *American Association of University Professors Bulletin.* Summer, 1950.

Shair, David I. How Effective Is the Non-Communist Affidavit? *Labor Law Journal.* September, 1950.

GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS

Congress. House. Committee on Education and Labor. Accident Prevention Act. Hearings. 81st Cong., 2nd sess. August 23 and 28, 1950.

——— ——— ——— Union Democracy. Hearings. 81st Cong., 1st and 2nd sess. 1950.

——— ——— Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Summary of Reorganization Progress During the Eighty-first Congress. 1950.

——— ——— Committee on Foreign Affairs. Survey of Activities of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Eighty-first Congress. 1950.

——— ——— Committee on Public Lands. Puerto Rico Constitution. Hearings. 81st Cong. 1950.

——— ——— Select Committee on Lobbying Activities. Expenditures by Corporations to Influence Legislation. 81st Cong., 2nd sess. 1950.

——— ——— ——— General Interim Report. 81st Cong., 2nd sess. 1950.

——— ——— ——— Lobbying, Direct and Indirect. Hearings. Parts 4 through 9. 81st Cong., 2nd sess. 1950.

Congress. Senate. Committee on Armed Services. Interim Report of the Preparedness Subcommittee on: Surplus Property, Rubber. 81st Cong., 2nd sess. 1950.

——— ——— ——— Universal Military Training. Hearings. 81st Cong., 2nd sess. 1950.

——— ——— Committee on Banking and Currency. Study of Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Lending Policy. Hearings Before Subcommittee. 81st Cong., 2nd sess. 1950.

——— ——— Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Action on Hoover Commission Reports: Report. 81st Cong., 2nd sess. 1950.

——— ——— ——— Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950. Report. 81st Cong., 2nd sess. 1950.

——— ——— Committee on Foreign Relations. Expanded International Information and Education Program. Hearings before Subcommittee. 81st Cong., 2nd sess. 1950.

——— ——— ——— Legislative History of the Committee on Foreign Relations. 81st Cong. 1950.

——— ——— Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Columbia River Basin. Hearings. 81st Cong., 1st and 2nd sess. 1950.

——— ——— ——— Fuel Study Proposals. Hearing. 81st Cong., 2nd sess. 1950.

——— ——— ——— Providing for the Admission of Alaska Into the Union. Report, with minority views. 81st Cong., 2nd sess. 1950.

——— ——— ——— Statehood for Hawaii. Report, with minority views. 81st Cong., 2nd sess. 1950.

——— ——— ——— Submerged Lands. Hearings. 81st Cong., 2nd sess. 1950.

——— ——— Committee on Public Works. Disaster Relief. Hearing before Subcommittee. 81st Cong., 2nd sess. 1950.

——— ——— Summary of Legislation Enacted by the Eighty-first Congress, 1st sess. and 2nd sess. 1950.

FOREIGN AND COMPARATIVE GOVERNMENT

Freedom and Planning in Australia. By A. Campbell Garnett. (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press. 1950. Pp. xi, 331. $4.00.)

Professor Garnett, whose field is philosophy, grew up in Australia. Since coming to the United States in 1938 he has returned twice to his native land. With his bi-national background, Mr. Garnett is admirably suited to write this kind of book. The volume seeks to interpret the spirit and social order of Australia for American readers. It is a successful effort, and the book is a rewarding socio-political explanation of the land "down under." Not least among its merits is the facile style of writing done within a well-planned outline of main topics. Skillfully blending history, economics, and politics, the author first discusses the land, its people, the development of political institutions, and basic public policies. The bulk of the text is concerned with twentieth-century Australia. Successive chapters cover trade unionism, governmental efforts to cope with the Great Depression, and the distinctive social institution of the Arbitration Courts. Then follows discussion of social services, employment policies, problems of socialization, and foreign affairs. A chapter on "Underlying Concepts and Attitudes" reveals the author's comprehensiveness and insight. Three final chapters were written in 1946 by members of the Liberal, Country, and Labor parties respectively. Designed to present party programs and policies, these essays are uneven in quality. Mr. Garnett's interpretation of the Australian political milieu goes far toward increasing American understanding of that nation's approach to political and economic problems. His value judgments and appraisals strengthen the book. There is much, too, that is provocative. While the author makes extensive use of materials written by others, he paraphrases to good effect. All in all, this work deserves reading for its explanation of how Australians have handled problems which we in America have faced. It is a welcome addition as an introduction to the politics and economic policies of Australia, or as a wholesome lesson in the comparative handling of issues and problems by a people who are closely akin to ourselves in spirit and outlook.—DAVID G. FARRELLY, *University of California, Los Angeles.*

British Politics Since 1900. BY D. C. SOMERVELL. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1950. Pp. 270. $3.75.)

For too long a time students of twentieth-century British politics have been dependent on studies of particular issues and elections and on such memoirs as Asquith's *Fifty Years of Parliament.* Here at last in one volume is a survey from 1900, when the Labour Representation Committee was organized, to the election of 1950. Political scientists may regret the absence of any discussion of party organization and the fact that the book does not begin at an earlier point. If it began some thirty years earlier, it might record the activities of the Birmingham caucus and the failure of the efforts on the part of "popular" leaders to wrest control of the Conservative and Liberal parties from their Parliamentary leaders. It may also be regretted that much space is devoted to such comparatively settled issues as those of the suffragette campaign. Nevertheless, this is the best book of its kind available. Particularly satisfactory are the character sketches of certain British politicians and the delineation of the issues on which successive elections in twentieth-century Britain have turned. Ramsay MacDonald is a "moderate with the equipment of a fanatic." Neville Chamberlain's contribution to public housing in the Britain between wars receives a deserved tribute, and his desire that the Baldwin Government fight the election of 1935 on the clear issue of the necessity for rearmament receives a timely, if belated, emphasis. Those who need this book most may be most reluctant to accept its conclusions.—ARTHUR B. DUGAN, *University of the South.*

Foreign Governments and Their Backgrounds. BY JOHN CLARKE ADAMS, WILFRED B. KERR, JULIAN PARK, AND JULIUS W. PRATT. (New York: Harper & Brothers. 1950. Pp. x, 968. $5.00.)

This textbook, designed for beginning students in comparative government, attempts, in a series of individually-written sections, to describe the existing governments of seven countries: England, France, Switzerland, Italy, Russia, Japan, and Germany. The book, marked throughout by clarity of thought and style and by a certain "folksiness" of tone, will doubtless succeed in stimulating the interest of undergraduate students. It contains a good deal of useful and concrete information, and is especially valuable for its attention to certain kinds of sociological data, particularly such matters as religion, climate, education, ethnology, and the press. Like most compendia, this one is somewhat uneven in the quality of its thought and in its treatment of subject matter. For example, political history and constitutional development are altogether ignored in the case of England but dealt with in the case of France; there is a brief and inadequate treatment of Italian Fascism but none at all of

German Nazism. More serious, the book rarely leaves the first level of description, and fails to concern itself in a significant way with principles of political organization and behavior. Similarly, it fails to make those comparative analyses out of which a systematic understanding of politics might possibly emerge. These faults, of course, are not peculiar to this work alone, and may, in fact, be inherent in the medium.—HERBERT McCLOSKY, *University of Minnesota.*

The Front is Everywhere; Militant Communism in Action. BY WILLIAM R. KINTNER. (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press. 1950. Pp. xi, 274. $3.75.)

If the Communist party is not a normal parliamentary party, what kind of beast is it? Answer: a military organization. As Col. Kintner sees it, "military methods and organization are inherent in the tactics and structure of every national Communist party—a truth which can be seen once the military nature of the Communist objective is laid bare" (p. 5). There is so much truth in this analogy that it is easy to understand Kintner's enthusiasm for it. Yet it must be said that he takes a somewhat over-literal and formalistic approach to the problem. Instead of using the analogy as a source of insight, deriving new propositions to illuminate an essentially political process, he contents himself with a point for point comparison between formal military organization and Communist party organization. This turns out to be unconvincing; and it leads to some rather important weaknesses in the analysis. Because of the over-literal military analogy, the role of violence in Communism is misconstrued. It is one thing to say, what is undoubtedly correct, that Communism will use violence whenever that is expedient; it is something else to say that we can better understand the nature of the party and its political strategy by relating that to the central aim of violence. In building a political army, the Communists have discovered a functional surrogate for violence—the continuous conquest of power in every area of social life. This activity, transforming members into deployable agents, requires and creates a quasi-military organization. The author does not fully grasp the relation between the Communist parties and the masses. In overemphasizing the military aspect he has largely ignored the fundamental synthesis which Lenin achieved. This synthesis is reflected in the effort to build an elite organization which is firmly linked, through organizational devices and stratagems, to the sources of potential power in society. Because he does not deal with this adequately, Kintner misreads the Communist idea of a "general staff of the revolution," looking for some structure in Communist organization analogous to the military general staff. In fact, however, this idea is relevant primarily to the way in which the vanguard party "guides and directs" the mass organizations over which it has control. In general, it is impossible to have a clear view of Communist organization, including its conspiratorial aspects, without a full understanding of the Party's role in the arenas of *political* combat. Notwithstanding the fact that some of us may find his analysis not fully adequate from the standpoint of political sociology, Col. Kintner's volume has the considerable merit of offering a fresh approach to the study of Bolshevik political warfare.—PHILIP SELZNICK, *University of California, Los Angeles.*

Histoire Politique de la Presse, 1944–1949. By Jean Mottin. (Paris: Éditions "Bilans Hebdomadaires." 1949. Pp. 188.)

This book deals with the prolonged crisis in postwar French journalism as expressed in governmental and parliamentary action. The essence of the crisis lies in the conflict and competition between prewar papers and those which were the fruit of the resistance and the liberation. The author stresses the effects of the *Loi Deferre* of May 11, 1946, which tried to stabilize and guarantee, within the French press, the situation created by the liberation in 1944, but which was passionately denounced by Herriot: "Cette expropriation-là, c'est le vol!" The book contains valuable surveys of the French press in 1939, before the outbreak of the war (pp. 22–27), at the end of 1944, after the regulation of June 22, 1944, which signalled the death of the old press (pp. 32–38), the status of the press in 1947, after the licensing by the Ministry of Information had been abolished (pp. 42–47), and its status on January 1, 1949 (pp. 138–144). The work traces the application of the *Loi Deferre* to April, 1949, on the administrative and judicial level, under the successive ministries of Gouin, Bidault, Blum, Ramadier, Schuman, Marie and Queuille. The application of the law—a "loi de circonstance" and, therefore, "un droit de circonstance"—against papers which had been cleared of collaboration with the enemy, is said to work to the benefit of the Communist press, and, to a certain degree, of the socialist press and the press of the "Mouvement Républicain Populaire" (M.R.P.). The study is therefore a plea for the restoration of full rights to the absolved papers, that they no longer be fettered by the *Loi Deferre.*—Fritz T. Epstein, *Stanford University.*

The Japan Science Review; Law and Politics, No. 1—Retrospect and Prospect of the Legal and Political Sciences in Japan. (Tokyo: Union of Japanese Societies of Law and Politics. 1940. Pp. iv, 111. $1.50.)

The Japan Science Review is designed to introduce to foreign countries the cultural activities of Japan. Two series were published in 1950: the engineering series and the law and politics series. The law and politics series is to be published in English annually. The second volume is scheduled for publication early in 1951. The Union of Japanese Societies of Law and Politics which sponsors this publication includes such associations as the following: Association of International Law, the Japan Criminal Law Association, the Japan Public Law Association, the Japan Association of Private Law, the Japan Association of Political Science, the Japanese Association of Sociology of Law, the Japan Legal Philosophy Association, the Legal History Association of Japan, the Jurisprudence Section of the Democratic Scientists' Society, and the Japanese Association of the Law of Civil Procedure. This volume contains twenty-five articles by members of Tokyo, Waseda and Keio Universities. The history and development of the following topics in Japan are discussed: legal history, sociology of law, public and private international law, constitutional law, administrative law, science of civil law, study of commercial, labor and industrial law, the law of civil procedure, criminal law, political science, science of public administration, history of political theory, political history and diplomatic history. Although the articles are brief, they apparently furnish a good summary of the present status of each of these fields in Japanese institutions of higher education. This work should serve as a ready reference to American political scientists who heretofore have had access only to fragmentary notes on the status of law and political science in Japan.—CLAUDE E. HAWLEY, *U. S. Office of Education.*

Digesto constitucional de la Nación Argentina. ISSUED BY THE DIVISION ARCHIVO PUBLICACIONES Y MUSEO OF THE CÁMARA DE DIPUTADOS DE LA NACIÓN ARGENTINA. (Buenos Aires: Imprenta del Congreso de la Nación. 1950. Pp. 559.)

This document contains the text of the national constitution of Argentina as adopted March 11, 1949, together with texts of the constitutions of the fourteen provinces as amended in conformity thereto. The revision of the national constitution of 1853 was provided for by law of September 3, 1948. The Convención Nacional Constituyente, elected on Dec. 5, 1948, convened at Buenos Aires on Jan. 24, 1949, and concluded its work on March 16 with the President of the Nation swearing to uphold the new Constitution. A stenographic report of the proceedings of the body was printed from sitting to sitting by the Imprenta del Congreso de la Nación as *Diario de sesiones* (pp. 566, xxix). The appendix contains the Constitution as approved. For the Convention, the *Reglamento* or rules of procedure, with a full index, were printed as a separate book (pp. 117), in an edition of 500 copies. For the 55-member Comisión Revisora de la Constitución, there is a separately printed report (pp. 69), dated March 4, containing only the changes proposed, and not the debates or discussion. The text of the proposed revision of the Argentine national constitution of 1853 had been approved by the executive council of the Partido Peronista on Jan. 6, 1949, and distributed as a separate pamphlet (pp. 54) entitled *Anteproyecto de reforma de la Constitución Nacional,* accompanied by three supplementary brochures. To aid the work of revision, the Biblioteca del Congreso issued in 1949 as its "Información bibliográfica—publicación no. 1" a bibliography (pp. 150) of especial importance for the Argentine material, provincial as well as national, entitled *Derecho constitucional y derecho público provincial.* Transitory provision no. 5 of the new national constitution authorized the fourteen provinces to revise their constitutions to conform. Texts of the revised provincial constitutions are included in the 1950 *Digesto.* As a means of comparison of the existing texts with those in force previously, there is a *Digesto constitucional de la Nación Argentina* (pp. 865) issued in 1941 by the División Archivo, Publicaciones y Museo of the national Cámara de Diputados.—JAMES B. CHILDS, *Library of Congress.*

Den Danske Rigsdag, 1849–1949, udgivet af Statsministeriet og Rigsdagens praesidium. (Copenhagen: J. H. Schultz Forlag.)

Beginning in 1949, the official centennial history of the Danish Parliament is being published. Hartvig Frisch was the chairman of the committee of five editing the work until his death in February, 1950, when he was succeeded by Jul. Bomholt. The plan calls for six volumes, each chapter or section prepared by specialists. The history of the Parliament from the Constitution of 1849 through 1866 is covered in the first volume (359 pp.) published in 1949; the period 1866 to 1949 is to be covered in the second. *Rigsdagen og folket* is the special title of the third volume (1950), treating of the Parliament in its relation to elections, political parties, press, etc. *Rigsdagen og arbejdsmåde* is the special title of the fourth volume (1950) dealing with the method of work. Finance laws, administration, courts, and the Royal Theater are to be treated in the fifth volume; and South Jutland, Faroes, Greenland, Iceland, and interparliamentary activities, in the sixth. Supplementing the history is a biographical dictionary of the membership of Parliament during the century beginning with the Constitutional Convention in 1848, prepared by Victor Elberling, parliamentary librarian, on the plan of Emil Elberling, his predecessor, under the title of *Rigsdagens medlemmer gennem hundrede aar 1848–1948* (Copenhagen: J. H. Schultz Forlag). More than 600 biographies are contained in the first volume (1949, pp. 314) through the letter K, nearly every sketch being accompanied by a portrait and by a statement of sources.—JAMES B. CHILDS, *Library of Congress.*

Constitutional Government and Democracy; Theory and Practice in Europe and America. BY CARL J. FRIEDRICH. (Boston: Ginn and Company. 1950. Pp. xvi, 688. $5.75.)

Revision of 1941 edition, containing new chapters on local self-government and socialization and planning, and an enlargement of the chapter on constitutional dictatorship to include a discussion of military government.

Scottish Democracy, 1815–1840; The Social and Intellectual Background. BY LAURANCE JAMES SAUNDERS. (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, Ltd. 1950. Pp. 444. 21s.)

Studies of rural and urban development, with careful attention to education, by a professor of constitutional law in the University of Edinburgh.

The English Government at Work, 1327–1336; Vol. III—Local Administration and Justice. EDITED BY JAMES F. WILLARD, WILLIAM A. MORRIS AND WILLIAM H. DUNHAM, JR. (Cambridge: Mediaeval Academy of America. 1950. Pp. xviii, 285. $5.00.)

Presents eight meticulously factual monographs on such topics as justices of the assize, shire officials, courts of common pleas.

Functional Representation; An Appeal to Supplement Political Representation. BY FRITZ NOVA. (Dubuque: William C. Brown Company. 1950. Pp. vi, 99. $2.50.)

A sympathetic summary of experience in Europe and of proposals in America, written by a professor of political science and history at Pennsylvania Military College.

Young Communists in the USSR; A Soviet Monograph Describing the Demands Made upon Members of the Komsomol Organization. TRANSLATED BY VIRGINIA RHINE. (Washington, D. C.: Public Affairs Press. 1950. Pp. 92. Paper, $2.50.)

Prepared for the Current Soviet Thought Series by the Joint Committee on Slavic Studies appointed by the Social Science Research Council and the American Council of Learned Societies. The original document was published in 1947 by the Ministry of the Armed Forces of the USSR.

Democracy and the Quaker Method. BY FRANCIS E. POLLARD, BEATRICE E. POLLARD AND ROBERT S. W. POLLARD. (New York: Philosophical Library. 1950. Pp. 160. $3.00.)

An examination by English Friends of Quaker methods of conducting business meetings, with suggestions for application of these methods to governmental agencies.

The Present Position of Foreign Area Studies in the United States; A Post-Conference Report. BY RICHARD H. HEINDEL. (New York: Committee on World Area Research, Social Science Research Council. 1950. Pp. 64.)

An interpretation of the discussions of the second national conference of the Social Science Research Council's Committee on World Area Research, May 1950. Surveys university area programs, area education and training, and the status of area research.

Introduction to Europe; A Selective Guide to Background Reading. PREPARED BY THE EUROPEAN AFFAIRS DIVISION, LIBRARY OF CONGRESS. (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office. 1950. Pp. 201. $1.00.)

An annotated, selective bibliography of English language writings covering individual European countries, to serve the purposes of general orientation and briefing. General background, history, present political and economic conditions and cultural aspects of each country are covered.

Research in Germany on Pressing Social Problems. BY DOLF STERNBERGER. (Washington, D.C.: European Affairs Division, Library of Congress. 1951. Pp. 33.)

The second survey by Dolf Sternberger of Heidelberg, Foreign Consultant to the Library of Congress, who reports on how Western Germany is coping with social issues and problems still to be solved.

Stortinget og Statsrådet, 1915–1945. (Oslo, Norway. 1949. 2 vols.)

A continuation, under auspices of the Parliament, of Tallak Lindstøl's history of the Norwegian parliament *Stortinget og Statsrådet, 1814–1914* (Kristiania, 1914–15, 2 vols. in 4). The first volume of the present work (878 pp.) is devoted to biographies, and was prepared by Vilhelm Haffner, for many years archivist of the Storting. The second volume (274 pp.) bearing the subtitle *De enkelte Storting* is devoted to the chronological record by parliament, and was prepared by Karl Bjørnstad. J.B.C.

Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte vom 15. Jahrhundert bis zur Gegenwart. BY FRITZ HARTUNG. (Stuttgart: K. F. Koehler Verlag. 1950. Pp. 378.)

A thoroughly revised fifth edition of the leading textbook on German constitutional history, with up-to-date bibliographies. It no longer forms part of the series *Grundriss* *der Geschichtswissenschaft*, and has been transferred from the Teubner publishing house, located in the Soviet Zone, to K. F. Koehler Verlag, in the American Zone of Germany. An extremely reliable guide, with almost too detached a judgment on the National Socialist period, the narrative is carried up to the spring of 1949, and the concluding chapter sketches the constitutional developments in the Western Zones and in the Soviet Zone of occupation. F.T.E.

Neue deutsche Agrarpolitik. BY WILLY NEULING. (Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr. 1949. Pp. 250.)

An outline of the basis, development, and tasks of German agriculture since the end of World War II, stressing the material aspects and the psychological effects of the changes brought about by the German defeat. It traces the principal epochs of German agrarian policy, i.e., the rule of the Junkers before World War I, developments since the 1920's, the struggle against the agrarian crisis, the Nazi attempt at self-sufficiency, the redistribution of land holdings, and new legislation regarding the ownership of land. F.T.E.

Julius Rodenberg und die "Deutsche Rundschau"; eine Studie zur Publizistik des deutschen Liberalismus, 1870–1918. BY WILMONT HAACKE. Vol. II of *Beiträge zur Publizistik*, edited by W. Hagemann. (Heidelberg: Kurt Vowinckel Verlag. 1950. Pp. 206.)

Approved as a work of distinction by Julius Petersen and Emil Dovifat. Originally a Berlin doctoral dissertation of 1936, whose publication was prevented at that time by Alfred Baeumler as "liberalistisch, positivistisch und philosemitisch." The *Deutsche Rundschau* was conceived as a German counterpart of the *Revue des deux Mondes* and periodicals like the *Quarterly Review* and *Contemporary Review*, as a continuous mirror reflecting the best in German intellectual life. A special chapter is devoted to the famous Geffcken affair in 1888 to 1889, after extracts from the 1870-1871 diary of Crown Prince Frederick were published in the *Deutsche Rundschau*. F.T.E.

L'administration locale à l'épreuve de la guerre, 1939–1949. BY PIERRE DOUEIL. (Paris: Recueil Sirey. Published under the auspices of the Fondation Nationale des Sciences politiques. 1950. Pp. 402.)

A comprehensive treatise on regional administrative powers under the Vichy regime and their political influence, as an illustration of authoritarian administration. The book also deals in great detail with Section 10 of the Constitution of October 27, 1948, regarding the extension of local liberties. F.T.E.

La France Équatoriale; Afrique Équatoriale française—Cameroun. BY EDOUARD TRÉZENEM AND BERTRAND LEMBEZAT. Collections "Terres Lointaines," Vol. I. 2nd ed. (Paris: Société d'Éditions Géographiques, Maritimes et Coloniales. 1950. Pp. 285.)

A veritable encyclopedia on the territory, dealing with history, geography, population, and the various aspects of the political, social and economic life of the region, with bibliographical and cartographical references. F.T.E.

Gosudarstvennoe pravo stran narodnoi demokratii [The Constitutional Law of the Countries with People's Democracy]. BY N. P. FARBEROV. (Moscow: Gos. izdatel'stvo juridicheskoi literatury. 1949. Pp. 327.)

Published by the All-Union Juridical Institute of the Ministry of Justice of the

U.S.S.R. and recommended by the U.S.S.R. Ministry of Higher Education as a textbook for law institutes and university schools of law. A comprehensive survey, showing step by step the constitutional changes in the so-called People's Republics—Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Roumania, Yugoslavia, Albania and Mongolia. An introductory chapter discusses common features in the fields of social and economic structure, basic rights and duties of the citizen, election laws, and organs of government, and stresses cooperation and friendship with the Soviet Union as the most important condition for the further development of the People's Republics. F.T.E.

Io, communista in Russia. By ETTORE VANNI. Testimoni per la storia del "nostro tempo." Collana di memorie, diari e documenti, Vol. VI. (Bologna: Cappelli. 2nd ed. 1950. Pp. 266.)

The sobering experience of an Italian Communist who came to the Soviet Union in May, 1939, as a fugitive from Spain after Franco's victory. He describes his various assignments such as with the School for Spanish Orphans, Kolchozy in the Caucasus, Sovchozy in the Crimea, and Radio Moscow. After eight years, he was permitted to leave the country. F.T.E.

Feliks Edmundovich Dzherzhinskii. By G. M. LIUBAROV. (Moscow: Pravda. 1950. Pp. 39.)

Feliks Dzierżyński. By TADEUSZ DANISZEWSKI. (Warsaw: Książka. 1948. Pp. 121.)

Liubarov's short biography (a public lecture) of the founder of the Cheka (b. 1877, d. 1926), who was also People's Commissar of Transportation and Chairman of the Supreme Economic Council, hails this sinister figure among the founders of the Soviet State as an unswerving and staunch supporter of Lenin's (and Stalin's) course and an enemy of all deviations. More valuable is Daniszewski's presentation of Dzierżyński's "life, work and fight," with particular emphasis on his revolutionary activities in Lithuania and Poland at the turn of the century. The book has 70 pages of documents, including autobiographical notes and letters to his family. F.T.E.

Stuttgart im Endstadium des Krieges. By KARL STRÖLIN. (Stuttgart: Friedrich Vorwerk Verlag. 1950. Pp. 68.)

As President of the International Association for Housing and City Planning, Stroelin tried repeatedly in 1939 and 1943 to work through the International Committee of the Red Cross for the humanization of aerial warfare, especially with regard to the protection of civilian populations. In 1942, he successfully intervened on behalf of Alsatians condemned to death, and was severely reprimanded by Himmler for his interference. The booklet traces the process of his change from a trusting National Socialist to a member of the opposition. F.T.E.

Gosudarstvennye dokhody SSSR [The State Revenues in the USSR]. By A. K. SUCHKOV. (Moscow: Gosfinizdat. 1949. Pp. 192.)

Admitted as a textbook in special schools of finance by the administration of the program for trainees in the Ministry of Finance of the USSR. F.T.E.

Boletin de la Biblioteca del Congreso, Nos. 60–72, 1947–8. (Buenos Aires: Biblioteca del Congreso de la Nacion. 1950).

A continuation of an indispensable index to Argentine legislation which was revived after the election of Peron. Important laws are reprinted, others are indexed chronologically and topically with full reference.

Revista del Instituto Etnologico Nacional. Vol. IV. (Bogota, Colombia: Instituto Etnologico Y de Arqueologia. 1949–50. Pp. 315.)

One of the most outstanding ethnological reviews in Latin America. The editor, Luis Duque Gomez, is currently publishing studies of heretofore isolated Indian communities before they become completely assimilated into the Hispanic-American culture.

NOTE ON RECENT WORKS ON PALESTINE AND ISRAEL

The spate of books appearing within the past two years that relate in one way or another to the new Jewish state in Palestine is worthy of some note. These writings represent a variety of types. They include works of autobiography, personal experience, history, international politics and war, government, religion, economics and philosophy. The majority of them, naturally, are by Jewish authors. A people that has managed to maintain its identity throughout the world as have the Jews in the nineteen centuries since the Diaspora would be likely to celebrate with literary outpouring the re-creation of a Jewish state in the land with which their tradition and prophecy have been so intimately bound up. Indeed, it need have caused no surprise had there been a greater stream of writing than has yet appeared to memorialize the success of Zionism, to rejoice at the sanctuary now absorbing so many of those displaced by the violence of late years, to defend the means by which the state of Israel came into existence, and in an historic sense to explain the Jewish outlook wherever Jews are found as separate and distinct population elements.

It is logical that so many of the recent books on Jewish Palestine should have come out in the English language. Aside from its place in world literature, no other contemporary tongue could reach such a large and appreciative audience. In modern times Jews have nowhere found more security, more ready understanding and more opportunity for the exercise of their religious tenets and their secular ambitions than in England and America. In both countries they have prospered; in both they have been listened to; and except for the peculiar services of both nations there assuredly would be no Israel today nor bright hopes for its future.

As has been suggested, there is little in the way of a common denominator in the recent publications relating to the state of Israel. One of them, in particular, is ancestral to most of the rest. As one who at an early stage became identified with the Zionist Movement and gave such character to it in the course of a long career that he became the first president of the Republic of Israel, Chaim Weizmann has provided an indispensable background for an understanding of the impulses culminating in a Jewish national home in Palestine in his autobiographical *Trial and Error.*[1] Born in Russia and educated there and in Germany, Weizmann was actively aware throughout his early life of the handicaps and burdens under which large numbers of Jews in eastern Europe had to labor for bare existence. Thus his represents one of the main currents of motivation that looked toward the restoration of Jewish authority in Palestine that there might be established in the Holy Land a refuge from both political and religious persecution. Many of the problems that came to the fore in the final phases of the struggle to set up an independent Jewish state in Palestine, which could only be done at the expense of others, undoubtedly reflected in some measure the mortal struggles of Jews in other lands. In noting that there were no pogroms in his native Russian district, Weizmann remarks that "it is a melancholy reflection on human relationships when the absence of murder must be noted as a special circumstance which calls for gratitude."

Nevertheless, some of the characteristics which often have kept the Jews apart from other peoples and which have made them subject to attack also crop out often in Dr. Weizmann's accounts of his earlier years. He observes, for instance, that "there were times when the non-Jewish world was practically excluded from our consciousness." Again he says, "we were separated from the peasants by a whole inner universe of memories and experiences"; and he recalls with relish the delight with which he and other Jewish students baited and tormented their Russian teachers. "Thus Judaism triumphed in the midst of oppression."

---

[1] *Trial and Error; The Autobiography of Chaim Weizmann.* (New York: Harper and Brothers. 1949. Pp. vii, 498. $5.00.)

Dr. Weizmann's account, while a personal narrative throughout, is likely to remain the principal source book for the student of Zionism. In it he records his "trials and errors," and in so doing discloses the various stages in the evolution of the plan to seize upon any favorable moment in the contests of the great powers to obtain a charter for a Jewish national home in Palestine, accompanied, if possible, by political powers. As President of the International Zionist Congress for a number of years, it is natural that he should identify the Zionist program with his own personal aspirations to a considerable extent. According to one of his critics, his sense of responsibility in these matters has led to some distortion of the actual circumstances under which Zionism as a movement originated and assumed characteristic form.

The critical student, indeed, would be well advised to read Dr. Weizmann's book in the light of the study made by Rabinowicz in his *Fifty Years of Zionism*,[2] whose "aim . . . is to draw . . . attention to a number of errors, inaccuracies and discrepancies, as well as conclusions. . . . " He sets down in this review an impressive number of points which he finds not to be entirely in accord with established fact. Perhaps his principal criticism lies in the relatively incidental credit given to Theodor Herzl, as the actual founder of the Zionist Movement, in *Trial and Error*. Rabinowicz regards Herzl as "the first Jewish statesman since the destruction of Jerusalem" and thinks that Weizmann could have accomplished little except for Herzl's basic work in Great Britain and elsewhere. He remarks that "Dr. Weizmann's method of substituting a retrospective judgment for impressions gained at the time is clearly discernible."

In attempting to place the work of Herzl in proper perspective, Rabinowicz points out that Weizmann, throughout most of his career, took no stock in Herzl's concept of state Zionism and that he therefore has discounted the work of his predecessor; only when confronted with the reality of Israel "after a struggle of fifty years against Herzlianism," did he accept the principle of statehood and the mass immigration of Jews into Palestine which is a concomitant of that principle. "*Trial and Error*," Rabinowicz insists, "persists in accentuating ideal and basic differences which, . . . as seen in retrospect, do not exist." He implies that a considerable part of *Trial and Error* is wishful thinking, but charitably suggests that some of the errors may be due to Dr. Weizmann's collaborators who may have been more concerned with effect than with fact.

Quite in contrast with Rabinowicz' work is a highly idealized biography of Weizmann by Rachel Baker.[3] In the creation of a new nation a certain amount of hero-worship is inevitable and perhaps even essential for welding dissident elements together. Idealism, however, is not always a sound base for the practical business of everyday life. The human interest of Mrs. Baker's account thus can not well be compared with the painstaking researches of Rabinowicz, to which the political scientist and the historian will turn in their efforts to measure the stature of the man who is so widely regarded as the symbol of the forces which have joined to bring forth the nation of Israel.

Among the writers who have attempted to arrive objectively at an appraisal of the several elements comprising the Palestine problem, Frank C. Sakran has accomplished a useful piece of work in his *Palestine Dilemma; Arab Rights Versus Zionist Aspirations*.[4] As he aptly remarks, "despite a flood of literature on the subject, the Arab side has not been adequately presented in this country." This might suggest a partisan attitude which the author undoubtedly believes that he has managed to avoid. Sakran treats his subject under three main heads: the country and its people, Palestine in history, and "the present muddle." He believes that the Arabs who were and are resident in Palestine have been wronged and that "it would be sheer folly for the Arabs to surrender their rights in Palestine in order that it may be 'developed' by another people." He is not optimistic as to the future of Palestine. He thinks that the creation of Israel by military force means the permanent enmity of the Arab nations, particularly since "Zionism has proved that it is expansionist by nature." "Partition of Palestine will settle nothing," he concludes, "and worse still, it contains the seed of war."

---

[2] *Fifty Years of Zionism*. By OSKAR K. RABINOWICZ. (London: Robert Anscombe & Company, Ltd. 1950. Pp. 131. 7s 6d.)

[3] *Chaim Weizmann; Builder of a Nation*. By RACHEL BAKER. (New York: Julian Messner, Inc. 1950. Pp. 180. $2.75.)

[4] *Palestine Dilemma; Arab Rights Versus Zionist Aspirations*. By FRANK C. SAKRAN. (Washington, D. C.: Public Affairs Press. 1948. Pp. viii, 230. $3.25.) This book was reviewed in the April, 1949, issue of this journal, pp. 395–6.

A more recent book, *The Realities of American-Palestine Relations*,[5] is "a history of United States concern with Palestine from the time of the appointment of the first consular agent in Jerusalem in 1832 through the most recent troublous events." The book is based to a large extent on materials not previously consulted with reference to Palestine problems, notably files of the Department of State in the National Archives and manuscripts in the Library of Congress. It is a competent piece of historical work, uncolored—as far as one can judge—by personal prejudice regarding Palestine issues. The final chapter, "The Changeling Policy," is an excellent account of the behind-the-scenes influences that led to the United States recognition of Israel and that explain present American-Israel relations.

Hurewitz' *The Struggle for Palestine*,[6] "a study of the Palestine problem since 1936 against the background of a world distracted by the ordeals of an approaching war, the war itself, and the fumbling for peace," is a work of great and lasting merit. Written by one with an intimate first-hand knowledge of the Middle East and fully documented from official sources, the book deserves to be characterized as a definitive work within the field of its compass. Not only has the author incorporated a great deal of factual information in his volume, including statistical detail where it will serve for clarification or for emphasis in the text, but he has also supplied a mature interpretation of the forces at work in Palestine. He has dealt judiciously, yet firmly, with the many controversial issues which make up the Palestine problem. For example, his analysis of the growth of Jewish population and industry, with balanced references to the indigenous Arab community, is noteworthy. By way of explaining the resort to force late in the 40's, he says of the disorders of 1936–38 that they "taught the lesson that the use of violence as a political weapon produced results which otherwise appeared unobtainable."

Among other highlights of the book, it may be observed that the author's treatment of the pro-British tactics of the Jewish Agency as a means of undermining the White Paper of 1939 and of outbidding the lukewarm Arabs is illuminating. Dissensions among the Jewish groups themselves are brought into the clear. Zionism as an economic threat to the entire Arab East is well discussed. In dealing with the activities of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry, the author fails to point out the prejudicial circumstances under which the American section of the Committee approached its task; but the schemes of certain elements in the United States Government and their bearing on the termination of the Mandate, on the one hand, and the opening of the Arab-Zionist war, on the other, are admirably handled. Both Arabs and Jews, he remarks, "had been sucked into the vortex of Big-Power rivalries, which served to obscure the merits of the Palestine problem and to vitiate the findings of an impartial investigation." When Britain relinquished the Mandate there were no Arab political institutions to fill the void. The Jews, on the other hand, had made plans, and when the declaration of independence was announced the

---

[5] *The Realities of American-Palestine Relations*. By Frank E. Manuel. (Washington, D. C.: Public Affairs Press. 1949. Pp. viii, 378. $5.00.) This book was reviewed in the October, 1949, issue of this journal, pp. 1071–2.

[6] *The Struggle for Palestine*. By J. C. Hurewitz. (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc. 1950. Pp. 404. $6.00.)

State of Israel was ready. Hurewitz concludes with the observation that Israel's ultimate survival in the nature of things will be determined as much by the outcome of the cold war as by the ability of the Jews and Arabs to establish friendly relations.

Two other books which purport to deal comprehensively with Palestine and the rise of Israel may be mentioned, though neither can claim much credit for objectivity. Arthur Koestler, a journalist, has presented in *Promise and Fulfilment; Palestine 1917–1949*[7] a "subjective pursuit of the objective truth," which aptly applies. Part I on "Background" is a fair and reasonably dispassionate summary. Part II, "Close-up," is, as he says, a "close and coloured" view of the Jewish war and of incidents in the creation of the new state. Part III, "Perspective," is a rational treatment of the political structure of Israel and what the author believes to be its principal problems and handicaps—the trend toward theocracy, in particular. Koestler believes that the existence of independent Israel is due mainly to purely subjective factors plus that margin of chance "which orthodox determinists always tend to overlook." Although a British subject and the sometime recipient of British official aid, he bitterly denounces British Palestine policy. At the same time, he gives little credit to the United States, which supplied the improbable element that made Israel possible. He deplores terrorism but considers its use in the struggle for Israel as "morally justified." In sorting out the essentials in the rise of Israel he has written fearlessly and has produced a useful volume.

In the same general category belongs Dunner's *The Republic of Israel; Its History and Its Promise*,[8] which is an extremely one-sided, ill-organized survey of Jewish history, the Zionist movement, and the rise of Israel. Dr. Dunner is obsessed with the wrongs done the Jews, principally, he implies, because of religious prejudice. In the realm of contemporary politics, he is bitter because Transjordan was "lopped off" from Palestine, all of which, he seems to believe, belongs in Jewish hands. He takes a very dark view of the Arabs and absolves the Jews from all responsibility for the Palestine war. He also expresses a conviction of British "guilt" for many unfortunate circumstances, including Arab illiteracy, Hitler's murder of hundreds of thousands of Jews, and the resort to Arab-Jewish hostilities in Palestine. Some of his statements ring strangely: this, for example, that the Arab land in Palestine purchased by the Jews was "mostly the land which Arabs and British officials had deemed uncultivable." He does not appear to realize that except for the very considerable aid furnished by the Jews of America—to say nothing of the Christians—the outlook for Israel would be dim, indeed. All in all, it may be doubted that the book has accomplished much of value.

Illustrative of the confusion in U.N. and Anglo-American councils at the time of the sudden termination of British mandate authority and the outbreak of Arab-Jewish hostilities are the personal accounts of two members of the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry on Palestine and one member of the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine. Bartley C. Crum,[9] one of the American contingent in the earlier investigation, confesses his prior ignorance of the Palestine problem, but is no less hesitant in placing the blame for the impasse in Arab-Jewish relations on Great Britain or in viewing Palestine as the proving ground for democracy. His frequent intemperate statements are those of a man far removed from the world of realities. One of his opposite numbers in the British contingent of the Committee, Richard Crossman,[10] although more restrained in expression, is hardly less partisan in his espousal of the Zionist cause. Both writers have dwelt largely on incidents of travel and observation. Jorge García-Granados,[11] a Guatemalan and a member of the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine from May, 1947, to May, 1948, in a similar personal narrative, records his satisfaction over the fact that the United Nations plan of settlement of the Palestine problem miscarried and that the Jews were able to create their own independent state "in the same way in which every people through history has won freedom." The highlight of the book is the vivid account of the reaction of the various national delegations at the United Nations to the unheralded announcement of United States recognition of the provisional government of Israel.

---

[7] *Promise and Fulfilment; Palestine 1917–1949.* By Arthur Koestler. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1949. Pp. xv, 335. $4.00.) This book was reviewed in the March, 1950, issue of this journal, pp. 213–4.

[8] *The Republic of Israel; Its History and Its Promise.* By Joseph Dunner. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company. 1950. Pp. xvi, 269. $4.75.)

[9] *Behind the Silken Curtain; A Personal Account of Anglo-American Diplomacy in Palestine and the Middle East.* By Bartley C. Crum. (New York: Simon & Schuster. 1947. Pp. xiv, 297. $3.75.)

[10] *Palestine Mission; A Personal Record.* By Richard Crossman. (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1947. Pp. 256. 10s 6d.)

Features of the Arab-Jewish troubles, culminating in the war of 1948, are treated in a number of the books adverted to in this survey. *Experiment in Anarchy,*[12] written by the last Chairman of the Jerusalem Municipal Commission, is one of the best possible first-hand accounts of conditions in and about Jerusalem during the waning days of the Mandate. He gives a very good and objective picture of the anomalous position occupied by Great Britain in consequence of promises to the Arabs, on the one hand, and the Balfour Declaration, on the other. Another recent book, *The Army of Israel,*[13] by an officer of the Zionist forces, deals specifically and exclusively with military operations in Palestine in 1948. It is a straightforward account, largely innocent of political digressions, and well illustrated with photographs and maps.

The deterioration of the situation in Palestine, as British authority waned, from strikes, riots and organized raids to open hostilities, naturally has given rise to discussions in print of the issues involved and the policies of the great powers. One of these polemics came from the pen of a former U. S. Under Secretary of State, Sumner Welles. In his *We Need Not Fail,*[14] written before the outcome of the Arab-Jewish war could be foreseen, he lays much blame for local troubles on the vacillations of American policy. Obviously he had little use for (or knowledge of) the Arabs. He reaches the conclusion that "By using all of our influence to prevent the birth of an independent Jewish Commonwealth in Palestine we have been . . . preventing the creation of the one Near Eastern state that would prove to be a true democracy, and a democracy that, because of the manner of being of its people, as well as because of their own self-interest, would unquestionably be an unswerving supporter of the Western cause." Being concerned solely with the welfare and future prospects of the state of Israel, Jeremiah Ben-Jacob[15] raises the question, "Will the United States stand by the young nation?" He concludes that there is reason to believe that it will, while he regards Soviet policy toward Israel as "extremely contradictory and unpredictable." He believes that "in resisting and overpowering the Arab League Israel has performed a singular service to humanity," and that "it has made possible the release of constructive forces among the Arab peoples and the use of a new spirit of regional cooperation." Ben-Jacob thinks that it was equally miraculous that Israel came into existence and that it has since been able to pursue a policy of neutrality in the cold war "based on friendship with the two rival world powers." He seems to regard these circumstances as pointing the way to a kind of divine mission, that of making "a distinct contribution to the arithmetic of international justice." Another, meatier, volume written in

[11] *The Birth of Israel; The Drama As I Saw It.* By JORGE GARCÍA-GRANADOS. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1948. Pp. ix, 291, v. $3.00.)

[12] *Experiment in Anarchy.* By R. M. GRAVES. (London: Victor Gollancz Ltd. 1949. Pp. 238. 15s.)

[13] *The Army of Israel.* By LT. COL. MOSHE PEARLMAN. (New York: Philosophical Library. 1950. Pp. xiv, 256. $5.00.)

[14] *We Need Not Fail.* By SUMNER WELLES. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1948. Pp. xiv, 143. $2.50.)

[15] *The Rise of Israel.* By JEREMIAH BEN-JACOB. (New York: Grosby House. 1949. Pp. 217. $3.00.)

admiration of the new state of Israel is Kenneth W. Bilby's *New Star in the Near East.*[16] Bilby believes that there is little room for sentiment in the world of practical affairs. "Only the status quo counts," he says. Applying this line of philosophy, he remarks, "Political recognition follows the rule of conquest. . . . You govern where your soldiers stand. . . . Never compromise territorial gains for the sake of an ephemeral political advantage." The book's principal contribution lies in its assessment of developments since the armistice. The author believes that the Arab states will attempt a "second round" with Israel. "It is my contention . . . that no treaty, no scrap of paper, will be able to dry up the vast reservoir of animosity and suspicion in the Middle East." For the most part, however, he views the Arab with contempt. He gives an excellent account of the disorders which have threatened the internal security of Israel. He remarks, "terrorism, as a weapon to achieve political ends, remains fresh in the minds of its progenitors in Israel. Its potential danger stems from the extreme ease with which it can be revived." His treatment of Communism in Israel might leave the reader concerned over the size and character of that element, but he concludes that "America can confidently base its policy on [the] assumption . . . that the socialist labor regime will not swing into the Russian orbit."

The Russian case for Israel is represented by Abraham Magil, whose *Israel in Crisis*[17] is as thoroughly anti-American as the author could contrive to make it. He begins his discussion with a remarkable definition of objectivity: he says that he was a partisan of the struggles and aspirations of the people of Israel and that "such partisanship is inseparable from objective historic truth." His remarks throughout are similarly warped. He states dogmatically, for example, that "The Palestine policy [of the United States] was the evil fruit of the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan. With the creation of the Jewish state, the old guard of imperialism did not surrender. There opened a new and sordid chapter, called United Nations mediation and conciliation, though a more accurate name would be Anglo-American strangulation." Although a New Yorker, Magil sees good only in the aims of the Soviet Union, which "wants nothing of the Middle East except freedom from war and the threat of war." He regards Malik as "Israel's best friend on the [U.N.] Security Council." United States oil companies operating in the Middle East are the "Middle East plunderbund." He asserts that the present Israel government is disloyal: "to side with the chief architect of the North Atlantic Pact is to back the chief threat to Israel's independence." It would be unprofitable to advert here to the many ways in which the author repeats characteristic Communist charges of American "imperialism" and "aggression." He concludes with a program for Israel of the nationalization of all foreign-owned concessions, the nationalization of all imports, and the establishment of state-owned industrial and cooperative agricultural enterprises in close accord with Soviet Russia.

In complete contrast with the two preceding works is the small book *Palestine Is Our Business* by Millar Burrows.[18] Mr. Burrows feels that "Zionism is basically and logically wrong . . . ." "The right of a majority of the people of a country to choose their own government would hardly be questioned," he thinks. "The Zionist assumption was that the right should be exercised only when the majority had become Jewish." He emphasizes this point by citing the refusal of the Zionists to accept any form of self-government in Palestine while they remained a minority. He places the action of the Arab states in the Arab-Jewish war of 1948 in a rather unusual light by stating that "the armies of the Arab nations invaded Palestine only in the sense that the American Army invaded England during World War II. The Arabs of Palestine welcomed them as their defenders against the Jews." He adds that "the native people of Palestine cannot be held responsible for what has really caused the whole trouble, the imposition upon them of an enormous body of immigrants from other lands, with ways very different from theirs and speaking a language they do not understand." In conclusion, Burrows voices a deep concern: "If the pro-Russian elements in Israel should someday become dominant, our support of Israel might turn out to have given Russia a bridgehead behind our defenses in Turkey and Iran. . . . At best the position of the Israeli Government as between East and West is neutral . . . . Neutrality may be in the interests of world peace, but it is not in accord with the confident assurance which has often been expressed that Israel would be a strong ally for us in case of conflict with Russia." In the present state of world affairs, this is the key question in the minds of a great many Americans. Undoubtedly it will be the principal factor in the years ahead not only in shaping the attitude of most Americans toward the Republic of Israel but also in determining the place Israel is to occupy in the Middle East and in the world at large.

---

[16] *New Star in the Near East.* By Kenneth W. Bilby. (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company. 1950. Pp. 279. $3.50.)

[17] *Israel in Crisis.* By A. B. Magil. (New York: International Publishers. 1950. Pp. 224. $2.50.)

[18] *Palestine is Our Business.* By Millar Burrows. (Philadelphia: Westminster Press. 1949. Pp. 155. $2.50.)

HALFORD L. HOSKINS.

Library of Congress.

ARTICLES AND DOCUMENTS ON

FOREIGN AND COMPARATIVE GOVERNMENT

MARIO EINAUDI

Cornell University

General

Berthelot, André. Le Problème de l'Elimination des Armes Atomiques. *Esprit.* November, 1950.

Specific Areas

United Kingdom

Barker, *Sir* Ernest. British Constitutional Monarchy. *British Information Services.* 1950.

Beacham, A. Nationalisation in Theory and Practice. *Quarterly Journal of Economics.* November, 1950.

Clegg, Hugh. Labour in Nationalised Industry. *Fabian Research Series.* Number 141, 1950.

Croft, Harold. Conduct of Parliamentary Elections. *Labour Party.* 1949.

Davies, Nigel. Conservatives and Peace. *Conservative Political Centre.*

Hurcomb, *Lord.* The Development of the Organisation of the British Transport Commission. *Public Administration.* Autumn, 1950.

Joy, Ned Vernon. Fair Compensation under the British Labor Government. *Political Science Quarterly.* December, 1950.

Labour Party. Labour and the New Society: A Statement of the Policy and Principles of British Democratic Socialism. *Victoria House.* 1950.

Lens, Sidney. Labor Unions and Politics in Britain and France. *Foreign Policy Reports.* November 1, 1950.

Liberal Party. Who's Who of 475 Liberal Candidates Fighting for the 1950 General Election. *Liberal Publication Department.* 1950.

Ligou, Daniel. Géographie Politique de l'Angleterre. *La Revue Socialiste.* October and November, 1950.

Macleod, Lain. One Nation; A Tory Approach to Social Problems. *Conservative Political Centre.* 1950.

McFadyean, *Sir* Andrew. The Liberal Case. London, Wingate, 1950.

Milne, R. S. The Junior Minister. *Journal of Politics.* August, 1950.

Ramsden, James. Should We Ban the British Communist Party? Yes. *National and English Review.* October, 1950.

Socialist Parties and European Unity: A British Labour Party View. *World Today.* October, 1950.

Taylor, Richard W. Central Planning in the United Kingdom. *Current Economic Thought.* May, 1950.

Tugwell, R. G. Afterthoughts about Nationalization. *Common Cause.* December, 1950.

Commonwealth of Nations

Abraham, Henry J. One Way to Get Out the Vote. (Australia.) *National Municipal Review.* September, 1950.

Banerjee, Dabandra Nath. Some Aspects of the New Constitution of India: Distribution of Legislative Powers. Calcutta, Indian Association, 1950.

Constitution of India, The, with short notes. Lucknow, Eastern Book Company, 1950.

De Basto, Gerald. An Indictment of Socialist Labor. Sydney; Executive, Sydney University Branch, Liberal Party of Australia, 1950.

Garran, Sir Robert, and others. Changing the Constitution. Sydney, New South Wales Constitutional League, 1950.

Indian Republic, Ministry of External Affairs. Memorandum on Question of Treatment of Indians in the Union of South Africa. Delhi, 1950.

——— Ministry of Home Affairs. Communist Violence in India. Washington, Embassy of India, September, 1949.

Kewley, T. H. Australian Commonwealth Government Corporations. *Public Administration.* Autumn, 1950.

Royal Commission Inquiring into the Origins, Aims, Objects and Funds of the Communist Party in Victoria [Australia] and Other Related Matters. Melbourne, J. J. Courley, Government Printer, 1950.

Rusch, T. A. Political Thought of the [Canadian] Cooperative Commonwealth Federation. *Journal of Politics.* August, 1950.

Sitaramayya, Pattabhi. The Nationalist Movement in India. Bombay, National Information & Publications, 1950.

Stevenson, John A. The Career of Mackenzie King. *Political Quarterly.* October-December, 1950.

Storey, H. M. The Anti-Communist Bill in the House of Representatives. *Australian Quarterly.* June, 1950.

Swaminathan, V. S. Pakistan Problems and Prospects. *Middle East Journal.* October, 1950.

Wallace, Elizabeth. The Origin of the Social Welfare State in Canada, 1867–1900. *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science.* August, 1950.

Western Europe

America and the Mind of Europe: Mid-Century. *Saturday Review of Literature.* Special Issue, January 13, 1951.

Battaglia, Roberto. Il Significato Nazionale della Resistenza. *Società.* June, 1950.

Berger, A. Significations du Plan Schuman. *Esprit.* October, 1950.

Berlia, Georges. Les Propositions Parlementaires de Revision Constitutionnelle. *Revue du Droit Public.* July–September, 1950.

Brochard, P. Les Syndicats Ouvriers devant le Projet Schuman. *Revue de l'Action Populaire.* September–October, 1950.

Brouckère, Louis De. La Crise Royale en Belgique. *La Revue Socialiste.* October, 1950.

Che Cos'è l'Europa? *Humanitas.* August–September, 1950.

Demondion, P. La Loi Municipale et les Communes Françaises en 1950. *La Revue Administrative.* September–October, 1950.

Dumeix, Auguste. Le Parti Communiste A Trente Ans: Le Parti Communiste, les Intellectuels et la Paix. *La Nouvelle Critique.* December, 1950.

Gazier. La Grève dans la Fonction Publique. *Droit Social.* September–October, 1950.

Ghini, Celso. Osservazioni sul Partito, le Sezioni e le Cellule: Verso il VII Congresso del P.C.I. *Rinascita.* October, 1950.

Joannès, Victor. Le Parti Communiste A Trente Ans: Une Date d'Histoire de France. *La Nouvelle Critique.* December, 1950.

Lavergne, Bernard. Le Plan Schuman ou Notre Alliance, Voire Notre Union, avec l'Allemagne Préferée a Notre Amitié avec l'Angleterre; L'Assemblée de Strasbourg. *L'Année Politique et Economique.* August–October, 1950.

Mauriac, François. La Funzione Comune della Francia e dell'Italia nell'Europa d'Oggi. *Studium.* September, 1950.

Michaut, Victor. La Dénonciation de la Social-Démocratie, Condition de l'Unité. *Cahiers du Communisme.* October, 1950.

Mounier, Emmanuel. *Esprit.* Special Memorial Issue, December, 1950.

Papa, Antonio. Orientamenti per uno Studio su Giovanni Giolitti. *Belfagor.* November, 1950.

Phillips, Paul. The German Trade Union Movement under American Occupation, 1945–1949. *Science and Society.* Fall, 1950.

Pinkney, David H. Nationalization on Trial: France. *Yale Review.* Autumn, 1950.

Ragionieri, Ernesto. Gaetano Salvemini, Storico e Politico. *Belfagor.* September, 1950.

Sturmthal, Adolf. Democratic Socialism in Europe. *World Politics.* October, 1950.

Suel, Marc. La Défense Nationale et la Constitution du 27 Octobre 1946. *Revue du Droit Public.* July–September, 1950.

Temmerman, J. A. Aspects Constitutionnels de la Question Royale en Belgique. *Parliamentary Affairs.* Autumn, 1950.

Trente Ans d'Histoire du Parti Communiste Français. *Cahiers du Communisme.* Special Issue, December, 1950.

Varloot, Jean. Le Parti Communiste A Trente Ans: Le Parti Communiste, les Intellectuels et la Nation. *La Nouvelle Critique.* December, 1950.

Virally, M. Remarques sur le Projet de Loi portant Statut Général des Entreprises Publiques. *La Revue Administrative.* July–August, 1950.

Waline, Marcel. La Grève des Agents des Services Publics; Valeur Juridique du Préambule de la Constitution. *Revue du Droit Public.* July–September, 1950.

Weill-Raynall, Etienne. Les Classes Sociales et les Partis Politiques en France. *La Revue Socialiste.* December, 1950.

Soviet Union and Eastern Europe

1917–1950. *U.S.S.R. Information Bulletin.* November 7, 1950.

Alessandrini, Federico. Stato e Chiesa in Polonia. *Studium.* October, 1950.

Arnold, G. L. Stalinism. *Political Quarterly.* October–December, 1950.

Creighton, Harriet B. Political Control of Science in the U.S.S.R. Oberlin College, 1950.

Czechoslovak Republic: Three Years of Planning in the Czechoslovak People's Democracy. [Translated from the Czech.] 1949.

Constitution of the People's Republic of Albania. Boston, Committee for the Defense of Albania.

Hazard, John N. Soviet Socialism and Private Enterprise. *New York University Law Review.* July, 1950.

Inkeles, Alex. Social Stratification and Mobility in the Soviet Union: 1940–1950. *American Sociological Review.* August, 1950.

Kertesz, Stephen D. The Methods of Communist Conquest: Hungary 1944–1947. *World Politics*. October, 1950.

Mikoian, Anastas Ivanovich. The Camp of Socialism and the Camp of Capitalism. Moscow, Foreign Languages Publications House, 1950.

Neumann, Robert G. Constitutional Documents of East-Central Europe. *Journal of Politics*. November, 1950.

Nikolaev, Nikolai P. L'Organisation Judiciaire Soviétique. *Le Monde Français*. September, 1950.

Pipes, Richard E. The First Experiment in Soviet National Policy: the Bashkir Republic, 1917–1920. *Russian Review*. October, 1950.

Ramadier, Paul. L'Union Soviétique et le Problème Atomique. *La Revue Socialiste*. November, 1950.

Schlesinger, Rudolf. Recent Soviet Historiography. *Soviet Studies*. October, 1950.

School Reform in Czechoslovakia. [Translated from the Czech by Stephen Jolly and F. O. Stein.] Prague, Orbis, 1949.

Tito. Workers Manage Factories in Yugoslavia. Belgrade, 1950.

Near and Middle East

Der Nahe und Mittlere Osten. *Uberseerundschau*. August, 1950.

Iran: Past and Present. Teheran, Bank Melli Iran Press, 1950.

'Iwais, Ya'Qub. Greater Syria Plan and Its Historical Background as Represented in the Egyptian Press. Cairo, 1950.

Turkish Elections of 1950 and United States Reaction. *Turkey Today*. Number 12.

Far East

Chou, En-Lai. Consolidate and Develop the Achievements of the Chinese People. *Soviet Press Translations*. November 1, 1950.

Engrebretson, T. O. Agriculture and Land Reform in Korea. *Foreign Agriculture*. October, 1950.

Hoang, Van Co. Un Peuple Qui Renait: Le Viet Nam devant les Problèmes de l'Indépendance. Paris, J. Vitiano, 1950.

Korea: An Annotated Bibliography of Publications in the Russian Language, compiled by A. Parry, J. T. Dorosh and E. G. Dorosh. Washington, Library of Congress, Reference Department, 1950.

Korea: An Annotated Bibliography of Publications in Western Languages, compiled by H. D. Jones and R. L. Winkler. Washington, Library of Congress, Reference Department, 1950.

Lindbeck, John M. H. Communism, Islam and Nationalism in China. *Review of Politics*. October, 1950.

Manifesto to the Peasants of Asia. *Monthly Bulletin of the International Peasant Union*. September–October, 1950.

Mao, Tse-tung. On People's Democratic Rule. *Marxist Pamphlets*. Number 5, 1950.

INTERNATIONAL LAW AND RELATIONS

America's Second Crusade. By WILLIAM HENRY CHAMBERLIN. (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company. 1950. Pp. viii, 372. $3.75.)

Those who see almost nothing good in American foreign policy during the last two decades will welcome this work by a seasoned observer of the international scene as a brilliant contribution to historical revisionism. Those who feel that responsibility for the tragic turn of world affairs lies mainly outside of Washington will classify Chamberlin with Beard, Morgenstern, Barnes, and other spokesmen of the new disillusionment. The charges which fill Mr. Chamberlin's pages are indeed formidable ones, and should be seriously considered, however extreme they may appear. Here are some samples: Germany and Russia should have been left "to shoot it out to their hearts' content" (p. 343). "There is no proof that Britain and France would ever have been attacked if they had not gone to war on the Polish issue" and "no factual evidence" has been unearthed of any Nazi plan "for offensive action against the Western Hemisphere" (p. 93). As far as the United States is concerned, World War II was Roosevelt's war. The danger to this country "was grossly exaggerated" (p. 135). The peace was lost while the war was being won. "America's crusading interventionists . . . were guilty of a colossal error in judgment and perspective" in their appraisal of "Soviet motives and intentions" (p. 343). "America's Second Crusade was a product of illusions which are already bankrupt" (p. 353). One becomes almost mesmerized by the marshaling of one damning indictment after another. Yet the serious student knows that indictment is no substitute for a careful weighing of the facts. Although the fruits of World War II have been bitter, there is more to the story of "America's Second Crusade" than blunders and betrayals, acquiescence in injustice, and "all-out appeasement." In attempting to fix responsibility for America's involvement in the war, is it not high time to look beyond the White House to the realities of international politics in the years prior to Pearl Harbor? The charges that this was Roosevelt's war, and that "Hitler really won the war," can only be labeled as grotesque distortions. Toward the end of his bitter volume Mr. Chamberlin remarks: "Americans cannot wring their hands in hopeless disillusionment" (p. 353); but the only positive policy he advocates is the rebuilding of Germany and Japan "as bastions against Soviet imperialist communism" (p. 355). Eventually, let us hope, we shall have objective and carefully documented studies of the origins of the Second World War. Until such time, the prophets of disillusion and the champions of "America's Second Crusade" will have their day.—NORMAN D. PALMER, *University of Pennsylvania.*

Major Problems of United States Foreign Policy 1950–1951. BY THE INTERNATIONAL STUDIES GROUP OF BROOKINGS INSTITUTION. (Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution. 1950. Pp. xiii, 416. Cloth $3.00. Paper $1.50.)

This is the fourth annual volume in a series of analytical surveys of the major problems of United States foreign policy. Monthly summaries of events supplement the annual compendium. In organization the current volume follows the pattern of its predecessors. Part one is a survey of the present position of the United States. Part two analyzes current problems with particular reference to the policies of the United States. The third part is given over to a problem paper. The distinctive feature of the series lies in the emphasis on the "problem approach" to foreign policy. As stated in the preface "this consists primarily in placing the authors and the users in the position of government officials who, in discharging their responsibilities in the solution of specific problems, must keep in mind the entire field of international relations, the interests and objectives of the United States, the various factors at home and abroad that condition American policy decisions, and the alternative courses of action that are open to the United States in the solution of a particular problem." Hitherto this treatment was reserved for the problem papers in the third part. The present volume injects this technique into the second part where functional and geographical problems are analyzed. Thus, under the Doctrine of Recognition, the statement appears: "The problem is to reexamine the United States doctrine of recognition and its applicability in the present world situation." After an analysis of this statement with particular reference to Communist China, four principle issues, together with several subsidiary ones, are put before the reader. This interspersion of current problems with alternative lines that lie before the policy makers provides a better focus for those who use the problem method as a pedagogical device. Previous volumes offered three or four "problem papers" prepared by the Institution and worked over by participants at the annual seminars. The latest volume has only one such paper, "The Security and Stability of Southeast Asia." Other papers will be prepared as pamphlets that may be purchased separately. This volume is more readable than earlier ones and should be more acceptable to upper division and graduate students. This reviewer still has reservations that it will appeal to the "general reader" and adult discussion groups.—ALBERT C. F. WESTPHAL, *University of New Mexico.*

The American Impact on Russia; Diplomatic and Ideological, 1784–1917. BY MAX M. LASERSON. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1950. Pp. xii, 441. $5.00.)

The present volume, as its title suggests, attempts an all-embracing survey of the ideological and diplomatic influence of the United States upon Russia from the days of Catherine the Great to the eve of the Bolshevik Revolution. According to Mr. Laserson, throughout this troubled period of over a century, the United States in Russian eyes "was ever the *enfant terrible* of the West, the fascinating, restless reformer and revolutionary, for long decades the sole standard-bearer of republicanism, and later the personification of economic progress and technological efficiency." At the same time, the author contends that American diplomacy *vis-à-vis* Russia was comparatively ineffectual because of the relative ignorance on the part of our representatives abroad of the state to which they were accredited. The relations of Russia and this country must ever be an absorbing subject—especially for us living now, when, in conjunction with political animosity, Soviet researchers are eagerly trying to obscure and disparage every Western contribution to Russian thought. Hence, we ought to be grateful for this work by a Russian scholar with as varied a background as Mr. Laserson possesses. Unfortunately, however, and contrary to the exaggerations of cover advertisement and preface, *The American Impact on Russia* is neither "highly original" nor "the first of its kind in English." To an important extent, it is a diligent reworking from studies—such as those of Frank Golder, Anatole Mazour, Foster Rhea Dulles, and others—already published in English and readily available in any scholarly library. In other words, the "field of American influence on Europe" is not as "neglected" as the author and his publisher would have us believe. It should further be added that the treatment of such outstanding Russian radicals as Bakunin, Lavrov, Kropotkin and Breshkovski—all significantly affected by an "American impact"—is totally inadequate. Finally, the book lacks a bibliography, critical or otherwise. Lest these remarks be considered unduly harsh, we should observe that once the dubious claim to "pioneer attempt" is dropped, Mr. Laserson's ambitious study will undoubtedly be found worthy of notice—in large part as a popularization of already existing materials.—DAVID HECHT, *Bowdoin College.*

India and the United States; Political and Economic Relations. BY LAWRENCE K. ROSINGER. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1950. Pp. vii, 149. $2.75.)

This book, which is issued under the auspices of the Institute of Pacific Relations, is based upon study and travel in India in 1949–50. After a background sketch of Indian-American relations down to 1945, the author studies the postwar period in fair detail. There are separate chapters on Nehru's policy of neutrality; domestic economic policy and its effect on relations with the United States; Indonesia; Kashmir and the United Nations; and the place of India in the British Commonwealth. Mr. Rosinger meticulously refrains from expressing his own opinion on these matters, and limits himself to a careful presentation of the facts. The result is a valuable and illuminating contribution to our understanding of the place of India in world affairs. The author makes it clear that Nehru has no intention of siding with the United States in the cold war if he can help it, and that he would meet with serious domestic opposition if he tried to do so. American financial and technical help is badly wanted in the program of industrialization and agricultural betterment, but there is a good deal of suspicion of American economic imperialism, especially among the rank and file of Nehru's supporters. The author believes, however, that Nehru is moving closer to the United States in his political and economic policy.—LENNOX A. MILLS, *University of Minnesota.*

A History of the Far East in Modern Times. BY HAROLD M. VINACKE. (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc. 1950. Pp. xix, 785. $5.00.)

Fifth edition (fourth edition 1941). Major additions are the inclusion of World War II and postwar developments through 1949 and greater attention to Southeast Asia, Indonesia and the Philippines.

Principles and Problems of International Politics; Selected Readings. EDITED BY HANS J. MORGENTHAU AND KENNETH W. THOMPSON. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1950. Pp. xiv, 68, xii. $4.00.)

A book of readings, with extracts from the writings of Alexander Hamilton, Woodrow Wilson, Gladstone, Disraeli, Lenin, Truman, Marshall, Kennan, Churchill, and others, making a total of 66 selections.

International Law Documents; 1948–1949. PREPARED BY U. S. NAVAL WAR COLLEGE. (Washington D. C.: Government Printing Office. 1950. Pp. vii, 264. $1.25.)

Prepared in collaboration with Professor Manley O. Hudson of Harvard University. This volume of a well-known series deals with international organization, trials of war criminals, rights of littoral states, air law, Antarctic territories, and constitutional provisions since 1945 relating to international law.

Documentary Textbook on the United Nations; Humanity's March Towards Peace. BY J. EUGENE HARLEY. (Los Angeles: Center for International Understanding. 1950. Pp. xxvii, 1470. $12.50.)

Second edition of a useful collection of documents and official actions, with enlarged bibliographies, revised to January, 1950.

Towards A World Community; Selected Speeches. PREPARED BY THE MOUNT HOLYOKE INSTITUTE ON THE UNITED NATIONS. (South Hadley, Massachusetts. 1950. Pp. 184. $2.00.)

Texts or summaries of twenty-five speeches delivered at the Third Annual Session of the Mount Holyoke Institute on the United Nations in the summer of 1950. Topics covered are technical assistance and Point IV, Germany and Japan in the community of nations, regional forces in international relations, and the United Nations and prospects for a world community.

The Diplomacy of the Dollar; First Era 1919–1932. BY HERBERT FEIS. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1950. Pp. vii, 81. $2.25.)

Lectures by a member of the Institute for Advanced Study, formerly adviser in the Department of State on international economic affairs. The title and its treatment are intended to demonstrate financial means of accomplishing public ends in foreign relations as distinguished from the private objectives of the old dollar diplomacy.

The Security of the Middle East; A Problem Paper. PREPARED BY THE INTERNATIONAL STUDIES GROUP OF THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION. (Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution. 1950. Pp. v, 66. Paper, $.60.)

Anglo-American Economic Relations; A Problem Paper. PREPARED BY THE INTERNATIONAL STUDIES GROUP OF THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION. (Washington, D. C.: The Brookings Institution. 1950. Pp. vi, 74. Paper, $.60.)

Inaugurating a series of short studies on problems of foreign policy confronting the United States. Each paper traces the background and development of the problem specified, identifies the main current issues, and analyzes the courses of action open to our government. Bibliographies are included.

Albert Gallatin and the Oregon Problem; A Study in Anglo-American Diplomacy. BY FREDERICK MERK. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1950. Pp. xiii, 97. $2.50.)

A case study of the negotiation of 1827 between Great Britain and the United States which led to the indefinite continuance of joint occupation of Oregon. The diplomatic process is illuminated by careful examination of historical, economic, political and personality factors on both sides, from primary sources.

The Genesis of Russophobia in Great Britain; A Study of the Interaction of Policy and Opinion. BY JOHN HOWES GLEASON. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1950. Pp. ix, 314. $5.00.)

A detailed analysis of Anglo-Russian relations, political and economic, between 1815 and 1841. *Harvard Historical Studies,* Vol. LVII.

International Crime and the U. S. Constitution. BY OLIVER SCHROEDER, JR. (Cleveland: Western Reserve University Press. 1950. Pp. iii, 75. Paper, $1.00.)

Legal study with extensive notes and citations by a member of the faculty of the School of Law at Western Reserve University.

Germany and the Fight for Freedom. BY LUCIUS D. CLAY. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1950. Pp. 83. $2.00.)

The 1950 Godkin lectures at Harvard University. The topics discussed are "The Struggle for Peace and Agreement"; "Progress Toward a West German Government"; and "German Policy and European Policy Integrated."

Hitler Directs His War; The Secret Records of His Daily Military Conferences. TRANSLATED AND ANNOTATED BY FELIX GILBERT. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1950. Pp. xxxiii, 187. $3.25.)

Extracts from the recovered fragments of the verbatim records of Hitler's conferences with his military advisers, December, 1942, to March, 1945. Though these fragments may not add greatly to our knowledge of Hitler and of the history of World War II, they make entertaining reading.

Invasion 1944; Rommel and the Normandy Campaign. BY HANS SPEIDEL. (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company. 1950. Pp. xiii, 176. $2.75.)

A defense of Rommel's military and political conduct as commander of the Germany Army Group during the summer months of the 1944 Normandy campaign. Written by Rommel's chief of staff, the account is strongly anti-Hitler.

Finland; The Adventures of A Small Power. BY HUGH SHEARMAN. (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Inc. 1950. Pp. xi, 114. $2.25.)

A brief history emphasizing modern external relations, published under the auspices of the London Institute of World Affairs.

Pakistan; The Heart of Asia. BY LIAQUAT ALI KHAN. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1950. Pp. xii, 151. $3.00.)

Consists chiefly of speeches made by the Prime Minister of Pakistan during his visit to the United States and Canada in May and June, 1950.

War and Civilization; From a Study of History. BY ARNOLD J. TOYNBEE, SELECTED BY ALBERT V. FOWLER. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1950. Pp. xiii, 165, $2.50.)

Passages from the six-volume work of Toynbee bearing upon the suicidal tendencies of militarism and upon the unsolved problems of sheathing the sword.

Um Recht und Gerechtigkeit. (Festgabe fuer Erich Kaufmann zu seinem 70. Geburtstage 21. September, 1950.) UEBERREICHT VON FREUNDEN, VEREHRERN UND SCHUELERN. (Stuttgart und Koeln: W. Kohlhammer Verlag.1950. Pp. vii, 402.)

Among the contributors to this volume are some of the best-known German scholars in the field of international law and international relations, such as Hermann Jahrreiss, who is represented by an article on state sovereignty and peace ("Staatssouveraenitaet und Friede"), and Walter Jellinek, who contributes critical remarks on the international law clause in German constitutions ("Kritische Betrachtungen zur Völkerrechtsklausel in den deutschen Verfassungsurkunden"). The volume also contains articles on the status of the functionary of official international organizations (by Erich Kordt), on the Nuremberg trials as a problem of law (by Otto Kranzbühler), on international law in the federal state (by Herbert Krueger), on the first *avis consultatif* of the International Court of Justice (by Hans-Jürgen Schlochauer), and on measures of nationalization and the compensation of afflicted foreigners in the international practice of recent years (by A. N. Makarov). F.T.E.

Befehl im Widerstreit; Schicksalsstunden der deutschen Armee 1923–1945. BY ADOLF HEUSINGER. (Tuebingen und Stuttgart: Rainer Wunderlich Verlag. 1950. Pp. 396.)

Though written in dialogue form and lacking documentary corroboration, this is one of the indispensable books for a true understanding of the relations between the German Army and National Socialism, and is written by a high-ranking officer who was a close observer of Hitler as a strategist. Contains maps and tables showing the chain of command in the German Army from 1921 to 1945 and the organization of the General Staff during World War II. F.T.E.

D'une Guerre à l'autre, 1919–1939; Souvenirs. BY GENERAL G. RÉQUIN. (Paris: Charles-Lavauzelle & Cie. 1949. Pp. 258.)

An important contribution to the history of the French Army between the World Wars, by one of the principal military advisers to the French Government. Motivated by an unrelenting suspicion of Germany, General Réquin was always an advocate of the strengthening of France's eastern defenses. His sentiments are clearly recognizable in his remarks about Count Bernstorff's and Stresemann's appearances at Geneva. Attention is called to Daladier's remark to Réquin about Beneš, who feared the Anschluss less than a return of the Hapsburgs (p. 226), and to revelations about French-American collaboration in 1938 (p. 239). F.T.E.

Le drame de Vichy; Vol. I: Face à l'ennemi, face à l'allié. BY YVES BOUTHILLIER. (Paris: Plon. 1950. Pp. 320.)

A detailed, almost day-by-day, pro-Pétain and anti-Laval account of French politics in the first months of the Vichy Government, by a former French Minister of Finance. While this volume deals mainly with questions of general policy, a reading of the revealing chapter "Les Mines de Bore et l'Or Belge" (pp. 229–238) leads one to await with great interest the more detailed account of the author's special responsibilities and experiences in the forthcoming second volume, entitled *Finances sous la Contrainte.* F.T.E.

Histoire de la Résistance, 1940–1944. BY HENRI MICHEL. (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France. 1950. Pp. 127. Que sais-je No. 429.)

The contribution of the resistance movement to the liberation of France, discussing its resources and methods, with special chapters on the underground press, the Maquis, and the Forces Françaises de l'Intérieur. F.T.E.

Trente ans de sureté nationale. BY JEAN BELIN. (Paris: Bibliothèque France-Soir. 1950. Pp. 328.)

Among political cases in which Commissioner Belin took a hand, were the Stavisky affair and the assassination of King Alexander and Barthou. There is also a chapter on the mysterious disappearance of the White Russian generals, Kutepov (on January 26, 1930) and Miller (on September 21, 1937). In passing, Belin also touches upon relations between the French police and the Gestapo. F.T.E.

Les Fabricants de Guerres; Espions allemands 1918–1950. BY JACQUES BLOCH-MORHANGE. (Paris: Editions "Je sers." 1950. Pp. 289.)

Claims existence of a "World Organization of German Influences" (without indicating any sources), as having survived its founder, Admiral Canaris, and as still working for German world domination, especially in countries of the East. This "sixth column" in all probability exists only in the phantasy of the author. F.T.E.

Frédéric Joliot-Curie. BY MICHEL ROUZÉ. (Paris: Les éditeurs français réunis. 1950. Pp. 77.)

A Communist appraisal of Joliot-Curie, making an appeal to the public to sign up for the absolute outlawing of atomic weapons, praising the famous physicist as the President of the Amitiés Franco-Polonaises, and the President of the Association France-USSR and the Comité Mondial des Partisans de la Paix. F.T.E.

Die Entstehung eines neuen Volkes aus Binnendeutschen und Ostvertriebenen. BY EUGEN LEMBERG AND LOTHAR KRECKER. (Marburg: N. G. Elwert Verlag. Schriften des Instituts fuer Kultur- und Sozialforschung, Muenchen, Vol. I. 1950. Pp. 168.)

Sponsored by the Institut fuer Kultur- und Sozialforschung in Munich, whose primary purpose is to deal systematically with structural changes among European peoples, this is the first well-documented case study of the mutual reactions of the indigenous populations in Western Germany and newcomers from Eastern Germany (refugees and expellees). The economic and psychological aspects of the integration of people from Eastern Germany were investigated by a group of teachers who were completely familiar with local conditions at places in the Hersfeld, Wolfshagen, Melsungen, Marburg, and Rotenburg districts. Of special interest is the contribution of Gustav Kraus concerning the fate of the textile industry in Asch after the expulsion of the Sudeten Germans and the initiative shown by the expellees in building up new industries. F.T.E.

Ostwärts der Oder und Neisse; Tatsachen aus Geschichte, Wirtschaft, Recht. BY PETER-HEINZ SERAPHIM, REINHART MAURACH AND GERHART WOLFRUM. (Hannover: Wissenschaftliche Verlagsanstalt K. G. Hannover v. Schroedel-Siemau & Co. 1949. Pp. 136, 10 maps.)

Ostdeutschland; ein Hand- und Nachschlagebuch fuer die Gebiete ostwaerts von Oder und Neisse. EDITED BY THE GOETTINGER ARBEITSKREIS. (Kitzingen /Main: Holzner-Verlag. 1950. Pp. 168.)

With an anti-Polish, rather than an anti-Soviet slant, these two books are outstanding examples of the type of German information and argumentation to be expected for the cementing of the German claim for return to Germany of the territories east of the Oder and the Neisse. The problem of expellees and refugees from the East will exercise a strong influence on Western German internal and foreign policy for any foreseeable future, and the problem cannot be separated from the German hope for a revision of the present frontiers and for the return of the refugees to their former homesteads. Therefore, it can readily be understood that books like these—in spite of assertions to the contrary—are not lacking in emotional undertones. F.T.E.

Ziemie Lubuska. EDITED BY M. SCZANIECKI AND ST. ZAJCHOWSKA. (Poznań: Drukarnia Uniwersytetu Poznańskiego. 1950. Pp. 579.)

The third volume in a series of illustrated monographs *Ziemie staropolski* [Old Polish Lands] published by the Instytut Zachodni [Western Institute] at Poznań. Previous volumes dealt with Lower Silesia (Vol. I of the series in two parts, 1947–1948) and Western Pomerania (Vol. II in two parts, 1949). Other volumes dealing with Upper Silesia and the Masurian region are in preparation. *Ziemie Lubuska* [the Lebuser Land] deals with regions formerly belonging to the Neumark Brandenburg, the Warthe- and Netzebruch, Land Sternberg and Posen-Westpreussen. The articles in the volume by various authors aim at giving a comprehensive picture stressing Polish trends. Contains a bibliography. F.T.E.

Ideologiia i politika Vatikana na sluzhbe imperializma [The Ideology and Politics of the Vatican in the Service of Imperialism]. BY M. M. SHEINMAN. (Moscow: Gos. izdatel'stvo politicheskoi literatury. 1950. Pp. 224.)

A pamphlet in book form, based mainly on left-wing and Communist literature denouncing the Vatican, "the most powerful capitalist organization in the world" and a tool of American imperialism, as a defender of capitalism, an enemy of democracy, and an ally of fascism. It accuses the Catholic Church of hatred of socialism and Communism, idealization of the Middle Ages, persecution of "progressive science," etc. The main body of the work deals with the post-war relations of the Vatican with different countries—Germany, Italy, France, the "Southern Bloc" (Spain and Portugal), and the support of an allegedly American-sponsored Far Eastern Block (Japan and Nationalist China). F.T.E.

Materialy sudebnogo protsessa po delu byvshich voenno-sluzhashchich japonskoi armii, obviniaemych v podgotovke i primenenii bakteriologicheskogo oruzheniia. (Moscow: Gos. Izdatel'stvo politicheskoi literatury. 1950. Pp. 538.)

The materials on the Chabarovsk trial (December 25–30, 1949) of twelve members of Japan's Kvantun Army, who were condemned to from two to twenty-five years at forced labor. Contains documents of the preliminary hearings, depositions of the accused and witnesses, experts' testimony, speeches of the Public Prosecutor and of the Defense Counsel, and the text of the verdict. An English edition has been published under the title: *Materials on the Trial of Former Servicemen of the Japanese Army Charged with Manufacturing and Employing Bacteriological Weapons.* (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publ. House. 1950. Pp. 536.) F.T.E.

Procesy wielkich zbrodniarzy wojennych w Polsce [The Trials of the Great War Criminals in Poland]. BY TADEUSZ CYPRIAN AND JERŻY SAWICKI. (Łódz: Czytelnik. 1949. Pp. 32.)

Published as No. 5 in a series, "Współczesne prawo procesowe" [Public Law Trials], by the prosecutors at the People's Supreme Court, who were members of the Polish Delegation at the Nuremberg trials and have already become known as the editors of a collection of documents showing in chronological sequence the development of German-Polish relations between 1937 and 1939 (*Agresja na Polskę w świetle dokumentów.* 2 vols., 1946). F.T.E.

Velká říjnová socialistická revoluce a naše národní svoboda [The Great Socialist October Revolution and our National Freedom.] (Brno: Rovnost 1950. Pp. 122.)

A collection of papers read at the Congress of Czech and Slovak historians in November, 1949, presenting the Communist view of Czech prewar international relations. The booklet contains a discussion of German-Czech negotiations in December, 1936, when the question of German-Czech cooperation against the Comintern was raised, and gives a new Soviet version of the Soviet attitude during the Czech crisis of 1938. F.T.E.

Materiały do dziejów nowożytnych ziem zachodnich [Materials on the history of the Western territories in modern times]. 2 vols.

Vol. I—*Materiały do statystyki narodowościowej Śląska Opolskiego z lat 1910–1939* [Materials Concerning the Statistics of Nationalities of Upper Silesia, 1910–1939]. By STEFAN GOLACHOWSKI. (Poznań-Wrocław (Posen-Breslau): Instytut Zachodni [Western Institute]. 1950. Pp. 120 and 22 statistical tables and map.)

Vol. II—*Polacy-Ewangelicy na Dolnym Śląsku w XIX w. i ich postawa narodowo-społeczna* [The Protestant Poles in Lower Silesia in the 19th Century and Their National-Social Behavior]. EDITED BY T. BRATUS, ST. GOLACHOWSKI, W. ROSZKOWSKA AND B. SAMITOWSKA. (1950. Pp. 358.)

Vol. I consists of confidential statistics and explanatory notes concerning the Polish minority in Upper Silesia in the 1920's and 1930's found among the documents of the former Prussian State Archives at Breslau, published in the original German version with Polish comment. These materials, the most revealing of which are based on a statistical survey of languages used at religious services, suggest a thorough revision of formerly known official German figures. The documents also throw light on the role of the Catholic Church in the nationality problem and on the methods of the National Socialist State. F.T.E.

Droit international et histoire diplomatique. ("Textes et Statistiques" publ. by the Faculty of Law and other institutions of the University of Grenoble. Vol. II.) By CLAUDE-ALBERT COLLIARD. (Paris: Editions Domat Montchrestien. 1948. Pp. 527.)

This collection of documents continues the line of outstanding French textbooks, such as Pierre Albin's *Les Grands Traités Politiques* (1910, 2nd ed. 1923) and Le Fur's *Recueil de Textes de Droit International Public* (1928, 2nd ed. 1934). Its timeliness and quality is shown by the fact that it will shortly be superseded by a new edition, carried up to the end of 1949. F.T.E.

Colonial Peoples' Struggle for Liberation. Reports to the Institute of Economics and Pacific Institute of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R. (Bombay: People's Publishing House. 1949. Pp. 99.)

A symposium on problems of the national and colonial movement after World War II. General statements by E. M. Zhukov and V. M. Maslennikov and regional reports on India, Viet Nam, Indonesia, Malaya, the Philippines, Arab East, Near and Middle East, Syria and Lebanon. F.T.E.

Diplomaticheskii immunitet [Diplomatic Immunity]. By D. B. LEVIN. (Moscow-

Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR, Institut Prava. 1949. Pp. 415.)

A monograph written with a good knowledge of relevant English and American literature. Of special interest to the non-Russian scholar are Ch. IV ("Diplomatic Immunity in Russia's Foreign Relations from the 16th to the 18th Centuries") and all sections of the book devoted to discussion of Soviet diplomacy—for instance, the assassination of Count Mirbach in 1918 and the similar attempt on von Twardowski in 1932; Soviet demands for the recall of Noulens in 1918 and the invalidation of diplomatic rights of Watanabe in 1924; the Entente diplomats in Russia in 1918 and 1919; and the exemption of Soviet trade missions from trial by ordinary foreign courts. F.T.E.

ARTICLES AND DOCUMENTS ON

INTERNATIONAL LAW AND RELATIONS

H. ARTHUR STEINER*

University of California at Los Angeles

ARTICLES

International Politics and National Policies

General

Barrett, William. World War III: The Ideological Conflict. *Partisan Review.* September–October, 1950.

Borrie, W. D. Population Pressure and International Relations. *Australian Quarterly.* June, 1950.

Friedmann, W. Western Policy at the Cross Roads. *Fortnightly.* September, 1950.

Prieto, Indalecio. Guerra Mundial? Vislumbrando el Porvenir. *Revista de America.* July–August, 1950.

Smogorzewski, K. M. Peace or War? *Nineteenth Century and After.* November, 1950.

Toynbee, Arnold. A Turning-point in the Cold War? *International Affairs.* October, 1950.

Wood, John J. The Morality of War. *Air University Quarterly Review.* Summer, 1950.

United States

Bolles, Blair. Asia Policy and the Election. *Far Eastern Survey.* December 6, 1950.

Buehrig, Edward H. Wilson's Neutrality Re-examined. *World Politics.* October, 1950.

Connally, Tom. Reviewing American Foreign Policy Since 1945. *Department of State Bulletin.* October 9, 1950.

Hessler, William H. The Limits of a Policy of Power. *United States Naval Institute Proceedings.* December, 1950.

Howard, *Maj.-Gen.* G. B. United States Defence Procurement in Canada. *International Journal.* Autumn, 1950.

Kennedy, Joseph P. Let's Wash Up Our Bankrupt Foreign Policy. *Commercial and Financial Chronicle.* December 14, 1950.

McDougal, Myres S. and Arens, Richard. The Genocide Convention and the Constitution. *Vanderbilt Law Review.* June, 1950.

Moulin, *Lt.-Col.* Alfred K. du. Can We Do Business With Moscow? *Military Review.* November, 1950.

Rusk, Dean. Fundamentals of Far Eastern Foreign Policy. *Department of State Bulletin.* September 18, 1950.

Science and Foreign Relations: Berkner Report to the U. S. Department of State. *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists.* October, 1950.

---

* Prepared with the assistance of Mr. Linford D. Riley, Jr.

Vlekke, M. H. B. Politik und Geschichte in Amerika: die Konferenz von Jalta. *Deutsche Rundschau.* September, 1950.

Wanger, Walter F. Donald Duck and Diplomacy. *Public Opinion Quarterly.* Fall, 1950.

Latin America

Acierto. The Economics of the Good Neighbor Policy: Dollar Bonds and Dollar Loans. *Inter-American Economic Affairs.* Autumn, 1950.

Chartener, William H. War Aid from Latin America. *Editorial Research Reports.* September 21, 1950.

Commonwealth of Nations

Alexander, Fred. South Africa's Indian Problem. *Far Eastern Survey.* December 6, 1950.

Appadorai, A. India's Participation in International Organizations—Administrative Aspects. *India Quarterly.* July–September, 1950.

Einzig, Paul. British Rearmament and U. S. Aid. *Commercial and Financial Chronicle.* December 7, 1950.

Haward, Edwin. The Commonwealth of Nations. *Fortnightly.* September, 1950.

Hodson, H. V. Race Relations in the Commonwealth. *International Affairs.* July, 1950.

Huizinga, J. H. The Cult of the Commonwealth: I. Myth of Reality. II. From Cives Britannici to Fideles Britannici. *Fortnightly.* October and November, 1950.

Mayhew, Christopher. British Foreign Policy Since 1945. *International Affairs.* October, 1950.

Neame, L. E. Nationalism in South Africa. *Fortnightly.* December, 1950.

Tyson, G. W. Indo-British Trade under the New Conditions. *Asiatic Review.* October, 1950.

Western Europe

Blow, Jonathan. Quiet Flows the Saar. *Quarterly Review.* July, 1950.

Crossman, R. H. S. No German Rearming without Atlantic Union. *Commentary.* December, 1950.

Dean, Vera Micheles and Gary, Howard C. Military and Economic Strength of Western Europe. *Foreign Policy Reports.* October 15, 1950.

Edelman, Maurice. Italy's Foreign Policy. *Political Quarterly.* October–December, 1950.

Ehrmann, Henry W. French Views on Communism. *World Politics.* October, 1950.

Kimche, Jon. Can Germany be Defended? *Nineteenth Century and After.* October, 1950.

Knaplund, Paul. Norway between East and West. *Quarterly Review.* October, 1950.

Loveday, Arthur F. Spain and England Look at Each Other. *Quarterly Review.* April, 1950.

Riemeck, Renate. Rearmament and Democracy in Germany. *Fortnightly.* December, 1950.

Wolfers, Arnold. West Germany: Protectorate or Ally? *Yale Review.* Winter, 1950.

Central and Eastern Europe

Cohen, Benjamin V. Violations of Human Rights in the Balkans. *Department of State Bulletin.* October 23, 1950.

Delams, Claude. Sur la Situation Présente de l'Europe Orientale. *Revue Politique et Parlementaire.* July, 1950.

Kertesz, Stephen D. The Methods of Communist Conquest: Hungary, 1944–1947. *World Politics.* October, 1950.

Koenig, Duane. Europe without the Dual Monarchy, 1918–1948. *Social Science.* April, 1950.

McCabe, Edward. The Return of the Austrian Problem. *Fortnightly.* October, 1950.

Mosely, Philip E. The Treaty with Austria. *International Organization.* May, 1950.

Seton-Watson, Hugh. The Sovietisation of Eastern Europe. *United Empire.* September–October, 1950.

Strausz-Hupé, Robert. Yugoslav Counter-Offensive in the Cold War. *Yale Review.* Winter, 1950.

The Soviet Union

Anderson, *Rear-Admiral* Hern. Russia's New Kind of War. *United States Naval Institute Proceedings.* November, 1950.

Crocker, *Lt.-Col.* H. E. Russian Strategy in Asia. *Army Quarterly* (London). October, 1950.

Hare-Scott, Kenneth. Soviet Grip on the Baltic Tightens. *Norseman.* September–October, 1950.

Pezet, Ernest. La Paix Rouge. *Revue Politique et Parlementaire.* July, 1950.

Roucek, J. S. Geopolitics of the U.S.S.R. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology.* October, 1950.

Russia's Eastern Marches: Sinkiang and Tibet. *Round Table.* September, 1950.

Tarn, R. S. Continuity in Russian Foreign Policy. *International Journal.* Autumn, 1950.

Middle East and Africa

Afghan Claims against Pakistan. *Asiatic Review.* July, 1950.

Chandler, *Lt.-Col.* F. H. Military Geography—Southwest Asia. *Military Review.* November, 1950.

Franck, Dorothea Seelye. The Interchange of Government Experts. *Middle East Journal.* October, 1950.

Holmes, Olive. Peoples, Politics and Peanuts in Eastern Africa. *Foreign Policy Reports.* December 1, 1950.

Moffat, Abbot L. The Marshall Plan and British Africa. *African Affairs.* October, 1950.

Mohn, Paul. Jerusalem and the United Nations. *International Conciliation.* October, 1950.

Osipov, G. The Peace Partisan Movement in the Near East. *Soviet Press Translations.* October 1, 1950.

The Far East

Chen, Po-ta. Stalin and the Chinese Revolution. *Soviet Press Translations.* November 1, 1950.

Chen, Y. S. China and Korea. *Asiatic Review.* October, 1950.

Fairbank, John K. The Problem of Revolutionary Asia. *Foreign Affairs.* October, 1950.

Greene, Marc T. Formosa. *Fortnightly.* December, 1950.

Hu Shih. China in Stalin's Grand Strategy. *Foreign Affairs.* October, 1950.

Kakehi, Mitsuaki. Nine Years After. *Contemporary Japan.* July–September, 1950.

Kawai, Kazuo. Japan in the Cold War. *World Affairs Interpreter.* Autumn, 1950.

Mah, N. Wing. Sino-Soviet Relations in Retrospect. *Russian Review.* October, 1950.

Mikheyev, V. The Korean People's Struggle for Unity and Independence. *Soviet Press Translations.* October 1, 1950.

Mitchell, C. Clyde. Political and Economic Significance of the Korean War. *International Journal.* Autumn, 1950.

Nomura, Kichisaburo. A Peace Treaty and Japan's Security. *Contemporary Japan.* July–September, 1950.

Purcell, Victor. Overseas Chinese and the People's Republic. *Far Eastern Survey.* October 25, 1950.

Riggs, Fred W. Tibet in Extremis. *Far Eastern Survey.* December 6, 1950.

Russell, *Sir* E. John. Asia's Food Problems and Their Impact on the Western Countries. *International Affairs.* July, 1950.

Soustelle, Jacques. Indo-China and Korea: One Front. *Foreign Affairs.* October, 1950.

Tiltman, Hessell. Japan and the Korean War. *Contemporary Japan.* July–September, 1950.

Wittfogel, Karl A. How to Checkmate Stalin in Asia. *Commentary.* October, 1950.

Woodman, Dorothy. Korea, Formosa, and World Peace. *Political Quarterly.* October–December, 1950.

Southeast Asia

Baeyens, M. James. Indo-China. *Asiatic Review.* October, 1950.

Goold-Adams, Richard. Holding on in Southeast Asia. *Quarterly Review.* October, 1950.

Griffiths, *Sir* Percival. Burma and Her Neighbours Today. *Asiatic Review.* July, 1950.

Mills, J. P. Problems of the Assam-Tibet Frontier. *Royal Central Asian Journal.* April, 1950.

Colonial and Dependent Areas

Bot, Th. H. Les Nouvelles Relations entre l'Europe et l'Asie: Les Pay-Bas et l'Indonésie. *Politique Etrangère.* August–September, 1950.

Cumper, George. This is the Evans Report. *Caribbean Quarterly.* Volume I, Number 3, 1950.

Gange, John. The Colonial Question in some British and American Overseas Possessions. *World Politics.* October, 1950.

Julien, C. A. From the French Empire to the French Union. *International Affairs.* October, 1950.

Leblond, Marius. Le Pacifique Français. *Revue de Deux Mondes.* September, 1950.

International Economic Policy

General

Lowe, John. Anglo-American Productivity. *Nineteenth Century and After.* November, 1950.

Metzler, L. A. Graham's Theory of International Values. *American Economic Review.* June, 1950.

Mikesell, Raymond F. Discrimination and International Trade Policy. *Review of Economics and Statistics.* August, 1950.

Warne, William E. Fourth World Power Conference, London, July, 1950. *Department of State Bulletin.* October 23, 1950.

Williams, Benjamin H. Economic Warfare. *Military Review.* October, 1950.

European Economic Organization

Pickles, William. Le Plan Schuman devant l'Opinion Britannique. *Politique Etrangère.* August–September, 1950.

Schüller, Richard. Economic Integration of Western Europe. *Social Research.* September, 1950.

Technical Assistance, Foreign Investment and Point Four

Brewin, F. Andrew. Canadian Economic Assistance to Underdeveloped Areas. *International Journal.* Autumn, 1950.

Dacey, W. Manning. Wanted: American Capital Exports. *Lloyds Bank Review.* October, 1950.

Hornsey, G. Foreign Investment and International Law. *International Law Quarterly.* October, 1950.

Kaplan, Jacob J. United States Foreign Aid Programs: Past Perspectives and Future Needs. *World Politics.* October, 1950.

Salera, Virgil. Point Four, International Investment, and the Future of International Trade. *Inter-American Economic Affairs.* Autumn, 1950.

Waynick, Capus M. Progress on Point 4. *Department of State Bulletin.* September 25, 1950.

International Finance

Kahn, R. F. The European Payments Union. *Economica.* August, 1950.

Shannon, H. A. The Sterling Balances of the Sterling Area, 1939–1949. *Economic Journal.* September, 1950.

Stolper, Wolfgang. Notes on the Dollar Shortage. *American Economic Review.* June, 1950.

International Law

Bodenheimer, Edgar. The Natural-Law Doctrine before the Tribunal of Science: A Reply to Hans Kelsen. *Western Political Quarterly.* September, 1950.

Brown, Philip Marshall. The Legal Effects of Recognition. *American Journal of International Law.* October, 1950.

Campbell, A. H. Diritto Internazionale e Teoria Generale del Diritto. *Rivista Internazionale di Filosofia del Diritto.* April–June, 1950.

Child, Clifton J. The Venezuela-British Guiana Boundary Arbitration of 1899. *American Journal of International Law.* October, 1950.

Cohn, E. J. German Enemy Property. *International Law Quarterly.* October, 1950.

Feinberg, N. The Interpretation of the Anglo-American Convention on Palestine, 1924. *International Law Quarterly.* October, 1950.

Fischer, Hugo. The Suppression of Slavery in International Law, II. *International Law Quarterly.* October, 1950.

Garcia-Mora, Manuel R. The Calvo Clause in Latin American Constitutions and International Law. *Marquette Law Review.* Spring, 1950.

Hambro, Edvard. The Relations between the International Court of Justice and International Organizations. *Western Political Quarterly.* September, 1950.

Honig, F. War Crimes Trials: Lessons for the Future. *International Affairs.* October, 1950.

Horwitz, Solis. The Tokyo Trial. *International Conciliation.* November, 1950.

Leibholz, Gerhard. Die Völkerrechtliche Stellung der "Refugees" im Kriege; Eine Betrachtung der Britischen Internierungspolitik Während des Letzten Krieges. *Archiv des Völkerrechts.* December, 1949.

Menaheim, Henry. Le Droit International et l'Opposition des Systèmes Economiques et Sociaux. *Politique Etrangère.* August–September, 1950.

Perlman, Philip B. The Genocide Convention. *Nebraska Law Review.* November, 1950.

Pound, Roscoe. Possibilities of Law for World Stability. *Syracuse Law Review.* Spring, 1950.

Preuss, Lawrence. Relation of International Law to Internal Law in the French Constitutional System. *American Journal of International Law.* October, 1950.

Roche, John P. The Loss of American Nationality—the Development of Statutory Expatriation. *University of Pennsylvania Law Review.* October, 1950.

Rogge, Heinrich. Rechtssysteme der Internationalen Friedenssicherung. Alte und Neue Aufgaben der Rechtswissenschaft. *Archiv des Völkerrechts.* December, 1949.

Rumpf, Helmut. Der Unterschied zwischen Krieg und Frieden. *Archiv des Völkerrechts.* August, 1949.

Schätzel, Walter. Die Annexion im Völkerrecht. *Archiv des Völkerrechts.* August, 1949.

Schick, Franz B. Videant Consules. *Western Political Quarterly.* September, 1950.

Scholz, Franz. Völkerrecht und Rechtssicherheit. *Archiv des Völkerrechts.* August, 1949.

Seidl-Hohenveldern, I. Austrian Decisions on Private International Law, 1945–1950. *International Law Quarterly.* October, 1950.

Selak, Charles B., Jr. Recent Developments in High Seas Fisheries Jurisdiction under the Presidential Proclamation of 1945. *American Journal of International Law.* October, 1950.

Theory of Legal Immunity of Soviet Vessels Abroad. *Current Digest of the Soviet Press.* November 25, 1950.

Vogel, Sheldon A. Extension of Admiralty and Maritime Jurisdiction. *Brooklyn Law Review.* April, 1950.

Wehle, Louis B. Comparative Law's Proper Task for the International Court. *University of Pennsylvania Law Review.* October, 1950.

International Organization

United Nations: General

Bentwich, Norman. The Benevolence of the United Nations. *Fortnightly.* October, 1950.

Brooks, E. A. S. Subsidiary Judicial Authorities of UNO to Hear and Decide Claims by Individuals and Corporations against States. *International Law Quarterly.* October, 1950.

Fawcett, J. E. S. China and the Security Council. *International Law Quarterly.* October, 1950.

Fox, Annette Baker. The United Nations and Colonial Development. *International Organization.* May, 1950.

Hamilton, Thomas J. The U. N. and Trygve Lie. *Foreign Affairs.* October, 1950.

Issues before the Fifth General Assembly. *International Conciliation.* September, 1950.

Keeton, G. W. Has U. N. O. Failed? *Nineteenth Century and After.* October, 1950.

Liang, Yuen-li. Abstention and Absence of a Permanent Member in Relation to the Voting Procedure in the Security Council. *American Journal of International Law.* October, 1950.

Rao, B. Shiva. The United Nations and Non-Self-Governing Territories. *India Quarterly.* July–September, 1950.

Romulo, Carlos P. The United Nations and the New State of Asia. *Yale Review.* Winter, 1950.

Silvain, Rene. Qui Empêche l'Entrée de la Chine Communiste à l'U.N.O.? *Revue Politique et Parlementaire.* June, 1950.

United Nations: Specialized Agencies

Lind, Lars. UNESCO's Work in Mass Communications. *Library Quarterly.* October, 1950.

Mackenzie, Melville. International Collaboration in Health. *International Affairs.* October, 1950.

Nicholas, H. S. U.N.E.S.C.O. *Australian Quarterly.* June, 1950.

The Thirty-third Session of the International Labour Conference: Geneva, June–July, 1950. *International Labour Review.* September–October, 1950.

Thomas, A. J., Jr. International Economic Regulation of Air Transport, I. *Washington University Law Quarterly.* Number 3, 1950.

Wang, Ging-hsi. UNESCO and International Scientific Organizations. *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists.* August–September, 1950.

Young, John Parke. Developing Plans for an International Monetary Fund and a World Bank. *Department of State Bulletin.* November 13, 1950.

Regional Organizations

Koever, J.-F. Strasbourg, Avenue de l'Europe ou Impasse des Nationalismes? *Revue Politique et Parlementaire.* October, 1950.

Levi, Werner. Union in Asia. *Fortnightly.* October, 1950.

Métral, Albert. È Possibile, e sotto quali Condizioni, l'Unione Tecnica, Economica e Monetaria dell'Europa? *Rivista di Politica Economica.* September–October, 1950.

Murray, John. Reflections on European Unity. *Studies.* September, 1950.

Pickles, W. The Strasbourg Illusion. *Political Quarterly.* January–March, 1950.

Wold, Terje. Europe and the Atlantic Alliance: A Norwegian Point of View. *Norseman.* September–October, 1950.

World Government

Holliday, W. T. World Law or World Anarchy: The Case for a World Federal Government. *Florida Law Journal.* January, 1950.

Linowitz, Sol M. Is World Government Feasible? A Reply to W. T. Holliday. *American Bar Association Journal.* July, 1950.

Oliver, L. Stauffer. World Government Inevitable. *Temple Law Quarterly.* July, 1950.

Military and Security Questions

Carver, *Lt.-Col.* George A. Military Support of the United Nations. *Military Review.* November, 1950.

Chaumont, Charles. A French View on Security through International Organization. *International Organization.* May, 1950.

Dacier, Michel. La Bombe Atomique et Notre Securitè. *Ecrits de Paris.* September, 1950.

Davis, John W. Ports and A-Bombs. *Military Review.* October ,1950.

Mott, *Comdr.* William C. Mutual Defense Insurance. *United States Naval Institute Proceedings.* November, 1950.

North American Defense: Coordination in Canada and the U.S.A. *Round Table.* September, 1950.

Parker, David B. The Atomic Battlefield. *Military Engineer.* September–October, 1950.

Scott, Stanley L. Mutual Defense Assistance Program. *Military Engineer.* November–December, 1950.

Thomson, *Sir* George. Hydrogen Bombs: the Need for a Policy. *International Affairs.* October, 1950.

Wells, W. T. Collective Defence or Successive Destruction. *Fortnightly.* September, 1950.

DOCUMENTS

Acheson, Dean. *Strengthening the Forces of Freedom,* Supplement: May–June, 1950. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1950 (Department of State Pub. 3852a).

British Information Services. Reference Division. Documents on Colonial Affairs: A Select List. New York, British Information Services, 1950 (ID 871, revised).

Canada. Department of External Affairs. Canada and the Korean Crisis. Ottawa, E. Cloutier, King's Printer, 1950.

Commonwealth Consultative Committee. The Colombo Plan for Co-operative Economic Development in South and South-East Asia; Report by the Commonwealth Consultative Committee. London, 1950.

[Gray, Gordon]. Report to the President on Foreign Economic Policies [November 10, 1950]. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1950.

International Court of Justice. Reports of Judgments, Advisory Opinions, and Orders. Anglo-Norwegian Fisheries Case. Order of March 29th, 1950 (I. C. J. Reports 1950. Sales no. 35).

——— ——— Case Concerning the Protection of French Nationals and Protected Persons in Egypt (Discontinuance). Order of March 29th, 1950 (I. C. J. Reports 1950. Sales no. 34).

——— ——— Colombian-Peruvian Asylum Case. Order of May 9th, 1950 (I. C. J. Reports 1950. Sales no. 40).

——— ——— Competence of the General Assembly regarding Admission to the United Nations. Advisory Opinion of March 3rd, 1950 (I. C. J. Reports 1950. Sales no. 33).

——— ——— International Status of Southwest Africa. Advisory Opinion of July 11th, 1950 (I. C. J. Reports 1950. Sales no. 42).

——— ——— Interpretation of Peace Treaties with Bulgaria, Hungary, and Romania. Advisory Opinion of March 30th, 1950 (I. C. J. Reports 1950. Sales no. 36).

——— ——— ——— Order of May 5th, 1950 (I. C. J. Reports 1950. Sales no. 39).

——— ——— Interpretation of Peace Treaties with Bulgaria, Hungary, and Romania (Second Phase). Advisory Opinion of July 18th, 1950 (I. C. J. Reports 1950. Sales no. 45).

International Labour Office. International Survey of Social Security. Geneva, International Labour Office, 1950 (Studies and Reports, New Series, no. 23).

Organization for European Economic Cooperation. Documents Relating to the European Payments Union. London, H. M. Stationery Office, 1950.

——— Report to the Economic Cooperation Administration on the 1949–1950 Programme. Vol. II, July 1, 1949–June 30, 1950 [Paris, Imp. Adm. Centrale, 1950].

United Nations. Administrative Tribunal. Statute and Rules. United Nations, 1950 (Doc. A/CN.5/2, 19 July 1950).

——— Commissioner in Libya. Annual Report, 1949/1950. United Nations, 1950 (Doc. A/1340, September, 1950).

——— Economic and Social Council. Assistance for the Civil Population of Korea [Report by the Secretary-General]. United Nations, 1950 (Doc. E/1851, 7 October 1950).

——— ——— The Suppression of Slavery and of the Slave Trade by Means of International Agreement. Mimeographed. United Nations, 1950 (Doc. E/AC.33/3, 2 February 1950).

——— ——— Economic Commission for Latin America. Trade Trends and Policies of Latin American Countries. United Nations, 1950 (Doc. E/CN.12/165, 1 May 1950).

——— ——— United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund Executive Board. Approved Plans of Operations for Asia as of 20 October 1950. United Nations, 1950 (Doc. E/ICEF/153, 20 October 1950).

——— ——— ——— Approved Plans of Operations for Latin America as of 24 October 1950. United Nations, 1950 (Doc. E/ICEF/154).

——— Food and Agriculture Organization. Revision of FAO Constitution, Rules of Procedure, and Financial Regulations. Mimeographed. United Nations, 1950 (FAO Doc. C50/6/Rev., 5 September 1950).

——— General Assembly. Coordination between the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies. Concentration of Effort and Resources. Note by the Secretary-General. United Nations, 1950 (Doc. A/1395, 26 September 1950).

——— ——— Disposition of Agenda Items of the Fourth Regular Session, 20 September–10 December 1949. United Nations, 1950 (Doc. A/INF/36, 31 August 1950).

——— ——— Report of the United Nations Commission on Korea, covering the Period from 15 December 1949 to 4 September 1950. United Nations, 1950 (General Assembly Official Records: Fifth Session, Supp. no. 16, A/1350).

——— ——— Commission for Eritrea. Report. United Nations, 1950 (General Assembly Official Records: Fifth Session, Supp. no. 8, A/1285).

——— ——— International Law Commission, Second Session. Report of the International Law Commission Covering its Second Session, 5 June–29 July 1950. United Nations, 1950 (Doc. A/CN.4/34, 2 August 1950).

——— ——— United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine. General Progress Report Dated 2 September 1950. United Nations, 1950 (Doc. A/1367, 22 September 1950).

——— Secretariat. Department of Economic Affairs. Proceedings of the United Nations Scientific Conference on the Conservation and Utilization of Resources, 17 August–6 September, 1949. United Nations, 1950.

——— ——— ——— World Iron Ore Resources and Their Utilization with Special Reference to the Use of Iron Ores in Underdeveloped Areas. United Nations, 1950 (Doc. ST/ECA/6, 25 August 1950).

——— ——— Department of Public Information. The International Trusteeship System and the Trusteeship Council. United Nations, 1949 (Reference Pamphlet no. 3, UN Pub. 1949. I.24).

——— ——— Department of Social Affairs. Freedom of Information: A Compilation. Vol. I. Comments of Governments. United Nations, 1950.

——— Security Council. Special Report of U. N. Command Operations in Korea. United Nations, 1950 (Doc. S/1884, 5 November, 1950).

——— Trusteeship Council. Official Records of the Sixth Session of the Trusteeship Council, 19 January–4 April 1950. Resolutions. United Nations, 1950 (Doc. T/635, 10 May 1950).

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. Report of the Director-General on the Activities of the Organization from October, 1949, to March, 1950, Presented to the Fifth Session of the General Conference, May–June, 1950. Paris, UNESCO, 1950 (UNESCO Pub. 711).

——— Fifth Session. Florence. Records of the General Conference . . . . Paris, UNESCO, 1950.

United States. Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Background Information on Korea. Report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs Pursuant to H. Res. 206 . . . . 81st Congress, 2d Session, House Report No. 2495. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1950.

——— ——— ——— ——— Background Information on the Soviet Union in International Relations. 81st Congress, 2d Session, House Report No. 3135. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1950.

——— Department of State. Division of International Conferences. Participation of the United States Government in International Conferences, July 1, 1948–June 30, 1949 . . . . Washington, Government Printing Office, 1950 (Pub. 3853).

——— ——— Documents on German Foreign Policy, 1918–1945. Series D, Vol. III: Germany and the Spanish Civil War, 1936–1939. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1950 (Pub. 3838).

——— ——— Far Eastern Commission. Third Report by the Secretary-General. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1950 (Pub. 3945).

——— ——— Foreign Service List, July 1, 1950. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1950 (Pub. 3868).

——— ——— Geneva Conventions of August 12, 1949, for the Protection of War Victims. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1950 (Pub. 3938).

——— ——— Point Four, Cooperative Program for Aid in the Development of Economically Under-developed Areas, Prepared by the Department of State with Assistance of an Interdepartmental Advisory Committee on Technical Assistance and of the Staff of the National Advisory Council. Washington, 1949.

——— ——— United Nations Action in Korea under Unified Command. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1950 (Seven reports to the Security Council by the United States Government during the period July 25–November 3, 1950; Department of State Pubs. 3935, 3955, 3962, 3978, 3986, 4006 and 4015).

——— ——— United States Policy in the Korean Crisis. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1950 (Pub. 3922).

——— Economic Cooperation Administration. Eighth Report to Congress of the Economic Cooperation Administration. Supplement. Economic Cooperation Agreements and Amendments Thereto Concluded July 1, 1948–June 30, 1950. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1950.

——— Economic Survey Mission to the Philippines [Bell Mission]. Report to the President of the United States. Washington, D. C. October 9, 1950. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1950.

——— Library of Congress. Legislative Reference Service. Far Eastern Economic Development and the West Coast Economy. Public Affairs Bulletin 84. Washington, 1950.

——— ——— Reference Department. Korea, an Annotated Bibliography of Publications in Western Languages . . . . Washington, 1950.

——— National Commission for the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. The UNESCO Story; a Resource and Action Booklet for Organizations and Communities. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1950 (Department of State Pub. 3931).

POLITICAL THEORY, RESEARCH AND METHODOLOGY

The American Mind; An Interpretation of American Thought and Character since the 1880's. By Henry Steele Commager. (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1950. Pp. ix, 476. $5.00.)

In *The American Mind* Professor Commager has done a prodigious piece of work with remarkable facility. Taking up the task left unfinished in Parrington's *Main Currents in American Thought,* Commager attempts to interpret the mind and character of America in the years between the 1880's and the 1940's. If the result is more illuminating than substantial, it is because the author did not intend to detail a chronicle of events but rather to highlight a subjective and elusive spirit. Fully recognizing the complexity of the modern world, he has made no effort to achieve a grand design through intellectual abstractions or artificial synthesis. In his spacious and colorful panorama, it is the American people, rather than institutions or forces, which dominate the scenes, and the people are individuals, neither masses nor classes. His heroes are significant persons, William James, Lester Ward, Thorstein Veblen, Henry Adams, Turner, Parrington and Beard, Pound, Brandeis and Holmes, men whose ideas influenced the American mind. Commager is particularly concerned with the political philosophy of America which came to repudiate *laissez faire* and to adopt the principle of government regulation for social welfare. This he saw as the main meaning of populism and progressivism, the New Freedom and the New Deal. He uses the academic social sciences, because he is most familiar with their ideas, to illustrate the impact of evolution and the importance of pragmatism in changing the American point of view but he reaches the climax of his thesis as he discusses the evolution of American law and the new jurisprudence, the revolt against mechanistic doctrines in law and the gradual judicial acceptance of progressive legislation with its profound social and economic consequences. The author plays the role of the disinterested commentator and the detached observer in a style reminiscent of Henry Adams whom he admires. He writes with good humor and keen wit, with perspicacity and shrewdness, though the scholarly specialists may charge him with superficiality since he has not weighted down his work with footnotes. He is broadly philosophical, consciously avoiding moral or ethical judgments though it is clear throughout that his heroes are moral crusaders whose objectives have been addressed to practical ends. He himself is a liberal with a staunch and optimistic faith in liberty and democracy, and in radicalism, which are basic in the American tradition. He has written a patriotic book, albeit with irony. He is sympathetic but not satisfied, gratified but not complacent with what he finds characteristic of his countrymen. As an American he believes this "the best of all countries" but he is doubtful that this is "the best of all times."—Marian D. Irish, *Florida State University.*

Citizenship and Social Class and Other Essays. By T. H. Marshall. (New York: Cambridge University Press. 1950. Pp. 154. $2.50.)

The title essay of this volume is an expanded version of a series of lectures given at Cambridge University. In this wise and meaningful study the author concerns himself with the impact which has been made on inequality by the developing theory and practice of citizenship in Great Britain. To this end he distinguishes between the civil, political and social rights that have given substance to modern equality and finds that focus on the first two in the 18th and 19th centuries respectively produced an equality that was not incompatible in practice either with broad inequalities of social class and economic rewards or with the contractual basis on which rested economic relations between individuals in a capitalistic society. However, 20th century extension of equality in economic and social spheres by the multiplication of social rights has created conditions different in kind from those which obtained under less complete definitions of citizenship. Professor Marshall notes that in current practice the areas in which inequality is permitted have been much reduced and altered. Moreover, the tendency to rationalize in a single social structure what previously was organized into private economic and public political spheres reduces the means for achieving inequality. But inequality is not eliminated. In terms of the need to maintain incentives and a balance of needed skills, government policy continues to support a measured inequality. The very fact that individual claims to social and material benefits under a system of social rights are not related in the specific instance to reciprocal service rendered re-establishes status as a social matrix, and this creates unmet needs for a social sense of obligation to replace the drives of "economic man." Until these are met, inequality has further services to render. Three additional essays complement this fresh and searching inquiry into the old problem of inequality. These deal with several aspects of the problem of social classes. All have been published previously, but their inclusion here adds a breadth to the treatment of the main essay that the scope of the original lectures did not permit.—THOMAS P. JENKIN, *University of California, Los Angeles.*

Introduction to Political Science. BY JOSEPH S. ROUCEK, GEORGE B. DE HUSZAR AND ASSOCIATES. (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell. 1950. Pp. xiv, 696. $4.75.)

This book provides additional evidence of the recognition by authors and publishers of the demand by teachers of government and politics for a different approach to the introductory course than that usually employed in basic texts. It indicates another attempt to provide "a survey of the fundamental principles" of politics, without the limitations imposed by the orthodox first course in American Government. For that effort the two editors and their fourteen associates deserve commendation. Yet, as too often appears in a symposium, even when carefully planned and edited, the book fails in part, both by commission and omission, to achieve the first feature claimed for it by the editors: to present "a synthesis of all the main aspects of political science." Except as it creeps in incidentally at a few points, there is no consideration of governmental functioning in the significant areas of commerce and business, public finance and financial institutions, labor relations, agricultural policies, guarantee and protection of civil rights. In some respects the organization is rather confusing and inexplicable. The annotated bibliography of books and articles at the end of each chapter is fairly adequate. The study questions and topics are of some potential benefit to the student and perhaps to the teacher. The volume as a whole is of considerable value as another elementary supplementary reference on principles of politics. It is not yet the book needed for a thorough study of basic principles.—J. Ben Stalvey, *University of Miami (Florida)*.

Public Opinion and Political Dynamics. By Marbury Bladen Ogle, Jr. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1950. Pp. v, 362, $3.50.)

Professor Ogle has given us a valuable new analysis of the factors which determine public opinion. This substantial textbook may serve college courses in the three fields of psychology, sociology, and political science as they deal with subjects of popular government. The mainmast of the democratic ship of state, according to Ogle, is the myth of democracy—the belief in the three great ideals of equality, liberty, and individualism. But the author explains that these great aspirations lead us into contradictory situations as individual and societal drives compete with each other. The confusion of minds and tongues which envelops all of us in a war-torn world is soberly analyzed in chapters on the myth, social institutions, and media of communication. Since the average book on opinion stresses "suggestion," an appealing chapter of this text develops the uses of force in persuading people to think right. As the philosophy of force gains adherents in every political camp, experts in manipulating the mass mind may wish to consult Ogle's scholarly analysis. Acknowledging his debt to pioneers in the field—Lowell, Lippman, Doob, Cantril, Childs, Gallup, and others—Professor Ogle has taken a firm step forward to give us a better all-round textbook.— Lincoln Harter, *University of Pennsylvania.*

The Discourses of Niccolo Machiavelli. Translated with an introduction by Leslie J. Walker. (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1950. 2 Vols. Pp. xiii, 585; v, 390. $15.00 per set.)

Appearing as one of the Rare Masterpieces of Philosophy and Science under the editorship of W. Stark of the University of Edinburgh, and initiating the series in the company of Bernard Bolzano's *Paradoxes of the Infinite* and John Taylor's *Inquiry into the Principles and Policy of the Government of the United States of America*, this new translation is enriched by a long introductory essay and extensive notes which fill the second volume. Leslie J. Walker, S.J., is dean and senior tutor of Campion Hall, Oxford, England.

A Study of Power; World Politics and Personal Insecurity. By Harold D. Lasswell. *Political Power.* By Charles E. Merriam. *Power and Conscience.* By T. V. Smith. (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press. 1950. Pp. v, 307; vii, 331; xv, 373. $6.00.)

A collection of three books now republished under one cover. Each of the three was published originally in 1934.

The Open Society and Its Enemies. By Karl R. Popper. (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1950. Pp. xii, 732. $7.50.)

American edition of an English work first published in 1945. In the "open society" men base decisions upon reason; in a "closed society," upon tribal taboos. One is democratic, the other totalitarian. The author, a philosopher at the University of London, treats particularly the origins of totalitarianism, with vigorous indictments of Plato, Hegel, and Marx.

Perspectives on a Troubled Decade; Science, Philosophy, and Religion, 1939–1949. EDITED BY LYMAN BRYSON, LOUIS FINKELSTEIN AND R. M. MACIVER. (New York: Conference on Science, Philosophy and Religion. Distributed by Harper & Brothers. 1950. Pp. xvii, 901. $5.50.)

Papers presented at the tenth symposium of the Conference on Science, Philosophy and Religion, September 1949. A number of political scientists are included among the ninety-five contributors and a substantial portion of the volume will be of interest to political scientists. The discussions "re-examine such broad problems as national unity, world peace, education, and conflicts of power, in the light of world developments and changing patterns of thought."

Mid-Century; The Social Implications of Scientific Progress. EDITED AND ANNOTATED BY JOHN ELY BURCHARD. (Cambridge & New York: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press and John Wiley and Sons, Inc., joint publishers. 1950. Pp. xx, 549. $7.50.)

Verbatim account of the discussions held at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology at its mid-century convocation in the spring of 1949. Of special interest to political scientists are the discussions on "Men Against Men—The Problem of the Underdeveloped Area"; "The Role of the Individual in a World of Institutions"; and "The State, Industry and the University."

Social Philosophies of an Age of Crisis. BY PITIRIM A. SOROKIN. (Boston: Beacon Press. 1950. Pp. xi, 345. $4.00.)

An enlarged version of the author's Cole Lectures at Vanderbilt University, April, 1950. Summary and comparative critical analysis of the social philosophies of Danielevsky, Spengler, Toynbee, Schubert, Berdyaev, Northrop, Kroeber and Schweitzer.

The Economics of Collective Action. BY JOHN R. COMMONS. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1950. Pp. xii, 414. $5.00.)

Posthumous publication of a book written after retirement. The analysis is along similar lines to that contained in the author's *Legal Foundations of Capitalism* and *Institutional Economics.*

Geschichtsschreibung und Weltanschauung; Betrachtungen zum Werk Friedrich Meineckes. BY WALTHER HOFER. (Muenchen: R. Oldenbourg. 1950. Pp. 553.)

The outstanding work of the postwar years in the field of German intellectual history, written by a Swiss historian. It is indispensable for an understanding of German thought, German philosophy of history, and the German conception of the state in the 19th and 20th centuries; at the same time, it is a moving tribute to the still-growing influence of the Nestor of German historians. F.T.E.

Vom Historismus zur Soziologie. BY CARLO ANTONI. TRANSLATED BY WALTER GOETZ. (Stuttgart: K. F. Koehler Verlag. 1950. Pp. 307.)

Revised German version of ten articles dealing with Wilhelm Dilthey, Ernst Troeltsch, Friedrich Meinecke, Max Weber, Johan Huizinga, and Heinrich Woelfflin, originally published in the periodical *Studi Germanici*, and showing the transition of German thought from the problems of "Historismus" to "typological sociology." The articles on the German thinkers are conceived as preparation for more comprehensive research on German intellectual life in the Wilhelminian era. The annotations give valuable hints as to relevant Italian publications. F.T.E.

Dogma and Wirklichkeitssinn in der Sowjetwirtschaft. BY ADOLF WEBER. (Sitzungsberichte der Bayer. Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philos.-historische Klasse. Jg. 1950. Heft 1. Pp. 52.)

Despite the distinguished place of its publication, this is a popular discussion of Soviet Marxist dogma, which is pictured as a hindrance to socio-economic progress, counteracted, however, by the actualities of Russian economic organization. In the author's opinion, Soviet economy has no better chance to survive than has capitalist economy. F.T.E.

Anthologie politique. BY ADRIEN FAVRE. (Paris: J. Peyronnet & Cie. 1950. Pp. 236.)

Nineteen chapters containing about 850 "fragments" relative or applicable to politics, in the widest sense. Favre gives only the names of the authors, and sometimes the titles of the works, where the sentence or paragraph has been lifted out; any closer identification is lacking in this purely accidental selection of quotations. F.T.E.

NOTE ON RECENT SORELIANA

The French present, with its heavy emphasis on party machines and mass organization, is even less kind to the syndicalist hopes of Georges Sorel than the first three decades of this century had been. If, nevertheless, the author of the *Reflections on Violence* continues to gain in status, it may be because Sorel's *oeuvre* was not confined to the one work which, for a few years, made him notorious. Thus, Fernand Rossignol can devote an entire book[1] to Sorel's methodology, exclaiming, "What was Sorel, what did he wish to be? A philosopher." This study, a careful investigation of the epistemological, ethical and aesthetical views held by Sorel at one time or another, has the great value of acquainting the reader who has neither the time nor the opportunity to unearth the widely scattered original texts, with the awe-inspiring scope of Sorel's interests, treating with particular acumen the multifarious influences which shared in producing the particular, and not always harmonious, blend of the Sorelian *Weltanschauung.* As to the political philosopher Sorel, a recently published French textbook[2] by Jean Jacques Chevalier devotes one of its sixteen chapters to the writer who has been credited—not very accurately—with having fathered both Leninism and Fascism. That Sorel's endorsement of the Bolshevik leader was based on a forgivable syndicalist misinterpretation of the early Soviet system, becomes quite clear in Sorel's recently published correspondence[3] with his best friend. Sorel's approval of *Il Duce* too appears to have been somewhat less than enthusiastic: the writer of these intimate letters, much as he rejoices over the discomfiture of the Giolittis and Turatis, feels acute anguish at the news of the laborite rout. It is to be hoped that other posthumous revelations will throw additional light on this and other dubious aspects of the Sorelian work. Meanwhile, an American publishing house is to be commended for having brought out the standard translation of the *Reflections,* long out of print, in a new, revised and enlarged edition.[4] Not only does it contain a very helpful general introduction by Edward A. Shils, but also has the text been enriched by inclusion of two appendices which had been missing so far in the English and American versions (the important chapter on "Unity and Multiplicity," which Sorel added to the 2d edition of 1910, and the famous plea "In Defense of Lenin," written for the 4th edition of 1919, both translated by J. Roth). It seems that T. E. Hulme's renowned translation of the main body of the work could stand some revising too: for instance, we find, on p. 43, "*droit naturel*" rendered as "natural justice," which is, however, better known as "natural law" or "natural right."

---

[1] *La Pensee de G. Sorel.* BY FERNAND ROSSIGNOL. (Paris: Bordas. 1948. Pp. 282.)

[2] *Les Grandes oeuvres politiques, De Machiavel a nos jours.* BY JEAN JACQUES CHEVALIER WITH A PREFACE BY ANDRÉ SIEGFRIED. (Paris: Collin. 1949. Pp. 406.) This book was reviewed in the June, 1949, issue of this journal, pp. 603–5.

[3] *Lettres à Paul Delesalle, 1914–1921.* INTRODUCTION BY ROBERT LOUZON AND JEAN PRUGNOT. (Paris: B. Grasset. 1947. Pp. 238.)

James H. Meisel.

University of Michigan.

---

[4] *Reflections on Violence.* By Georges Sorel. Translated by T. E. Hulme and J. Roth with an introduction by Edward A. Shils. (Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press. 1950. Pp. 311. $3.50.)

ARTICLES AND DOCUMENTS ON
POLITICAL THEORY

FRANCIS G. WILSON

University of Illinois

History and Criticism

Alfonsi, Luigi. Su un Tema del "Somnium Scipionis." *Latomus.* April–July, 1950.

Bardy, G., Le Patriotisme Égyptien dans la Tradition Patristique. *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique.* Number 1–2, 1950.

Beazley, Raymond. Bismarck and the Papacy under Leo XIII. *Quarterly Review.* October, 1950.

Bengston, Herman. Das Politische Leben der Griechen in der Römischen Kaiserzeit. *Die Welt als Geschichte.* Heft 2, 1950.

Birrell, J. A. Is Integrity Enough: A Study of George Orwell. *Dublin Review.* Third Quarter, 1950.

Block, Ernst. Eldorado und Eden, die Geographischen Utopien. *Sinn und Form.* Heft 3, 1950.

Brauer, Jereld C. Puritan Mysticism and the Development of Liberalism. *Church History.* September, 1950.

Cook, Gladys Calkins. Jean-Paul Sartre's Doctrine of Human Freedom and Responsibility. *Bucknell University Studies.* June, 1949.

Dvoichenko-Markov, E. Jefferson and the Russian Decembrists. *American Slavic and East European Review.* October, 1950.

Ferraroti, Franco. La Sociologia di Thorstein Veblen. *Rivista di Filosofia.* October–December, 1950.

Ford, Nick A. Walt Whitman's Conception of Democracy. *Phylon.* Third Quarter, 1950.

Griffith, G. O. Mazzini di Sempre. *Nuova Antologia.* October, 1950.

Grisewood, Harman. The Christian Socialists. *Quarterly Review.* October, 1950.

Hanbury, H. G. Blackstone in Retrospect. *Law Quarterly Review.* July, 1950.

Hawkins, Carroll. Harold J. Laski: A Preliminary Analysis. *Political Science Quarterly.* September, 1950.

Herrick, Jane. The Reluctant Revolutionist: A Study of the Political Ideas of Hipólito Da Costa, 1774–1823. *The Americas.* October, 1950.

Hofstadter, Richard. Beard and the Constitution: The History of an Idea. *American Quarterly.* Fall, 1950.

Jaspers, Karl. Zu Nietzsches Bedeutung in der Geschichte der Philosophie. *Die Neue Rundschau.* Heft 3, 1950.

Kohn, Hans. Romanticism and the Rise of German Nationalism. *Review of Politics.* October, 1950.

Landecker, Werner S. Smend's Theory of Integration. *Social Forces.* October, 1950.

Levenson, Joseph R. The Breakdown of Confucianism: Liang Ch'i-Ch'ao Before Exile—1873–1898. *Journal of the History of Ideas.* October, 1950.

Maridakis, G. S. Démosthene, Théoricien du Droit. *Revue Internationale des Droits de l'Antiquité.* Volume 5, 1950.

Macklem, Michael. Rousseau and the Romantic Ethic. *French Studies.* October, 1950.

Noble, R. E. G. L. Record's Struggle for Economic Democracy. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology.* October, 1950.

Oliva, E. Toda. Doctrinal Político de Mosén Diego de Valera. *Revista de Estudios of Politicos.* July-August, 1950.

Pietri, Arturo Uslar. La Extrañeza Americana. *Revista National de Cultura.* May–June, 1950.

Rossiter, Clinton. The Life and Mind of Jonathan Mayhew. *William and Mary Quarterly.* October, 1950.

Rothacker, Eric. Toynbee und Spengler. *Deutsches Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geisteswissenschaft.* Heft 3, 1950.

Rowbottom, Arnold H. China in the *Esprit des Lois:* Montesquieu and Mgr. Foucquet. *Comparative Literature.* Fall, 1950.

Shackleton, Robert. Montesquieu: Two Unpublished Documents. *French Studies.* October, 1950.

Silió, Francisco Javier de. Donoso Cortés en Su Tiempo y en el Nuestro. *Arbor.* September–October, 1950.

Smith, H. Shelton. Was Theodore Parker a Transcendentalist? *New England Quarterly.* September, 1950.

Steiner, H. Arthur. Perspectives on the Chinese Revolution. *Social Science.* October, 1950.

Steinhauer, H. "Of Man's First Disobedience": Rousseau and Modern Pessimism. *University of Toronto Quarterly.* October, 1950.

Streeter, Harold Wade. Sainte-Beuve's Estimate of Lafayette. *French American Review.* April–June, July–September, 1950.

Wallett, Francis G. James Bowdoin: Patriot Propagandist. *New England Quarterly.* September, 1950.

Weaver, Richard M. Agrarianism in Exile. *Sewanee Review.* Autumn, 1950.

Westlake, H. D. Thucydides and the Athenian Disaster in Egypt. *Classical Philology.* October, 1950.

Special Study and Analysis

A. M. G. Revolt on the Rand. *Blackwood's Magazine.* November, 1950.

Arendt, Hannah. The Mob and the Elite. *Partisan Review.* November–December, 1950.

Arnold, G. L. Stalinism. *Political Quarterly.* October–December, 1950.

Aron, Raymond. Social Structure and the Ruling Class. *British Journal of Sociology.* March, 1950.

Ayala, Francisco. Libertad y Techología. *Cuadermos Americanos.* November–December, 1950.

Basave, Augustín. Demo-Liberalismo y Corporativismo. *Revista de la Escuela de Estudios Contabiles.* October, 1950.

Bernard, Jessie. The Validation of Normative Social Theory. *Journal of Philosophy.* August 17, 1950.

Brinton, Crane. Individual Therapy and Collective Reform: A Historian's View. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry.* July, 1950.

Brown, William. The Psychology of Ideological Conflict. *Fortnightly.* November, 1950.

Brunswick, E. F. and Sanford, R. N. La Personalité Antisémite. *Les Temps Modernes.* October, 1950.

Burnham, James. Rhetoric and Peace. *Partisan Review.* November–December, 1950.

Cohen, Julius and Lillian. The Divine Right of Presidents. *Nebraska Law Review.* March, 1950.

Daniélou, Jean. The Conception of History in the Christian Tradition. *Journal of Religion.* July, 1950.

Delos, J. T. The Dialectics of War and Peace (II). *Thomist.* October, 1950.

East, W. Gordon. How Strong Is the Heartland? *Foreign Affairs.* October, 1950.

Foster, William Z. Le Front Populaire et la Démocratie Populaire. *Cahiers du Communisme.* September, 1950.

Gallagher, Harold J. American Liberalism at the Crossroads. *Canadian Bar Review.* November, 1950.

Gardner, Martin. Beyond Cultural Relativism. *Ethics.* October, 1950.

Goldschmidt, Walter. Social Class in America—A Critical Review. *American Anthropologist.* October–December, 1950.

Hacker, L. M., Lindblom, C. E. and Lerner, Max. The Democratic Limits of the Welfare State. *American Scholar.* Autumn, 1950.

Hazard, John N. Soviet Socialism and Private Enterprise. *New York University Law Review.* July, 1950.

Heimann, Eduard. On Economic Planning. *Social Research.* September, 1950.

Hocking, W. E. Fact and Destiny. *Review of Metaphysics.* September, 1950.

Kallen, H. M. Communism as a Secret Individualism. *Social Research.* September, 1950.

Kennedy, Walter. The Growing Danger of "Big Government." *Alabama Lawyer.* July, 1950.

Kogon, Eugene. Die Freiheit Die Wir Meinen. *Frankfurter Hefte.* August, 1950.

Kuhn, Helmut. The Christian Conscience in our Political World. *Measure.* Fall, 1950.

Lewis, John P. Our Mixed Economy. *Antioch Review.* Autumn, 1950.

Lukas, Edwin J. The Crisis in Political Rights. *Jewish Social Service Quarterly.* September, 1950.

Lundberg, George A. Can Science Validate Ethics? *American Association of University Professors Bulletin.* Summer, 1950.

MacLeish, Archibald. The American State of Mind. *American Scholar.* Autumn, 1950.

Mason, Alpheus T. Welfare Capitalism: Opportunity or Delusion? *Virginia Quarterly Review.* Autumn, 1950.

Mayo, B. Is There a Case for the General Will. *Philosophy.* July, 1950.

Messineo, A. La Libera Ricerca della Verità. *La Civilità Cattolica.* October 7, 1950.

Monro, D. H. The Concept of Myth. *Sociological Review.* Section 6, 1950.

Morandini, F. Filosofia ed Apostolato nell'Enciclica "Humani Generis." *La Civilità Cattolica.* October 21, 1950.

Niebuhr, Reinhold. The Conditions of Our Survival. *Virginia Quarterly Review.* Autumn, 1950.

Oakeshott, Michael. Rational Conduct. *Cambridge Journal.* October, 1950.

Palacios, Leopoldo Eulogio. La Primacía Absoluta del Bien Commun. *Arbor.* July–August, 1950.

Perruchot, Henri. What Epiphanism Proposes. *Books Abroad.* Autumn, 1950.

Pinon, René. La Volonte Americaine et l'Ordre Universel. *La Revue des Deux Mondes.* October 15 and November 1, 1950.

Poffenberger, A. T. The Physiology of Economic Man. *Political Science Quarterly.* September, 1950.

Polanyi, Michael. The Logic of Liberty: Perils of Inconsistency. *Measure.* Fall, 1950.

——— Scientific Beliefs. *Ethics.* October, 1950.

Preiss, Theo. The Vision of History in the New Treatment. *Journal of Religion.* July, 1950.

Pruche, Benoit. Le Thomisme-Peut Il Se Presenter comme "Philosophie Existentielle"? *Revue Philosophique de Louvain.* August, 1950.

Rockwell, Leo R. Academic Freedom—German Origin and American Development. *American Association of University Professors Bulletin.* Summer, 1950.

Röpke, Wilhelm. Die Nationalisierung des Menschen. *Merkur.* September, 1950.

Rudolph, Frederick. The American Liberty League, 1934–1940. *American Historical Review.* October, 1950.

Schmitt, Carl. Drei Stufen Historischer Sinngebung. *Universitas.* August, 1950.

Stalin, Joseph. Trois Lettres sur la Linquistique. *Cahiers du Communisme.* September, 1950.

Strauss, Leo. Natural Rights and the Historical Approach. *Review of Politics.* October, 1950.

Sturmthal, Adolf. Democratic Socialism in Europe. *World Politics.* October, 1950.

Timasheff, N. S. The Soviet Concept of Democracy. *Review of Politics.* October, 1950.

Tugwell, R. G. The New Deal: The Progressive Tradition. *Western Political Quarterly.* September, 1950.

Turner, Vincent. The Situation in Moral Philosophy. *Dublin Review.* Third Quarter. 1950.

Van Sickle, John V. The Tyranny of Idealism. *Kyklos.* Fasc. 1, 1950.

Vicen, Felipe González. El Positivismo en la Filosofía del Derecho Contemporánea. *Revista de Estudios Politicos.* July–August, 1950.

Weymann-Weyke, Walter. Das Falsche Entweder-Oder. *Frankfurter Hefte.* September, 1950.

White, R. J. New Whigs for Old. *The Cambridge Journal.* October, 1950.

Legal Theory and Public Law Issues

Antieau, Chester J. "Clear and Present Danger"—Its Meaning and Significance. *Notre Dame Lawyer.* Summer, 1950.

Bodenheimer, Edgar. The Natural Law Doctrine Before the Tribunal of Science: a Reply to Hans Kelsen. *Western Political Quarterly.* September, 1950.

Boyce, Gray C. Law and Justice for the Jew: The Jews in Medieval Germany. *Historia Judaica.* October, 1950.

Goble, George W. The Non-Stoppage Strike. *Current Economic Comment.* August, 1950.

Graham, Howard J. The Early Anti-Slavery Backgrounds of the Fourteenth Amendment. *Wisconsin Law Review.* July, 1950.

Levy, Ernst. The Reception of Highly Developed Legal Systems by Peoples of Different Cultures. *Washington Law Review and State Bar Journal.* August, 1950.

Mermin, Samuel. The Study of Jurisprudence—A Letter to a Hostile Student. *Michigan Law Review.* November, 1950.

Retrospect and Prospect of the Legal and Political Sciences in Japan. *Japan Science Review.* Number 1, 1950.

Schick, F. B. Videant Consules. *Western Political Quarterly.* September, 1950.

Smith, T. B. The Durability of the Scottish Legal Tradition. *Juridical Review.* April, 1950.

Timasheff, N. S. Is Soviet Law a Challenge to American Law? *Fordham Law Review.* June, 1950.

Wolff, Hans. J. Der Unterschied zwischen Öffentlichen und Privaten Recht. *Archiv. des Öffentlichen Rechts.* August, 1950.

ARTICLES AND DOCUMENTS ON

METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

HERBERT A. SIMON

Carnegie Institute of Technology

Philosophy of Social Science

Black, Duncan. The Unity of Political and Economic Science. *Economic Journal.* September, 1950.

Bowman, Claude. Polarities and the Impairment of Science. *American Sociological Review.* August, 1950.

Churchman, C. W. and Ackoff, R. L. Purposive Behavior and Cybernetics. *Social Forces.* October, 1950.

Dieterlen, Pierre. Politique Economique et Analyse Economique. *Revue Administrative.* March–April, 1950.

Easton, David. Harold Lasswell; Policy Scientist for Democratic Society. *Journal of Politics.* August, 1950.

Firey, Walter. Mathematics and Social Theory. *Social Forces.* October, 1950.

Research Methods and Organization

Anderson, C. Arnold. The Striving for Cooperative Autonomy: American Social Sciences over Fifty Years. *Social Forces.* October, 1950.

Greenwood, Ernest and Massarik, Fred. Some Methodological Problems in Social Work Research. *American Sociological Review.* August, 1950.

Koopmans, T. C. and Reiersol, O. The Identification of Structural Characteristics. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics.* June, 1950.

Lentz, Theodore F. Report on a Survey of Social Scientists Conducted by the Attitude Research Laboratory. *International Journal of Opinion and Attitude Research.* Spring, 1950.

Proceedings of the World Association for Public Opinion Research, at the International Conference on Public Opinion Research, Paris, France, September 7–9, 1949. *International Journal of Opinion and Attitude Research.* Summer, 1950.

Simon, Herbert A. Modern Organization Theories. *Advanced Management.* October, 1950.

Smith, Bruce Lannes. Proposals for Unified Bibliographic and Reporting Systems for the Social Sciences. *International Social Science Bulletin.* August, 1950.

Vito, Francesco. Should the Methods of Political Economy Be Revised? *International Social Science Bulletin.* Autumn, 1950.

Motivation and Personality

Crown, Sidney. Some Personality Correlates of War-Mindedness and Anti-Semitism. *Journal of Social Psychology.* February, 1950.

Hayes, Samuel P. Some Psychological Problems of Economics. *Psychological Bulletin.* July, 1950.

Luchins, Abraham S. Personality and Prejudice: A Critique. *Journal of Social Psychology.* August, 1950.

Parsons, Talcott. Psychoanalysis and the Social Structure. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly.* July, 1950.

Poffenberger, A. T. The Physiology of Economic Man. *Political Science Quarterly.* September, 1950.

Opinions and Attitudes

Bauer, Raymond A. and Riecken, Henry. Opinion in Relation to Personality and Social Organization. *International Journal of Opinion and Attitude Research.* Winter, 1949–50.

Crespi, Leo. The Influence of Military Government Sponsorship in German Opinion Polling. *International Journal of Opinion and Attitude Research.* Summer, 1950.

Dodd, Stuart C. A Verifiable Hypothesis of Human Tensions. *International Journal of Opinion and Attitude Research.* Spring, 1950.

Lahy, B. Application of Psychological Methods to the Analysis of Opinions. *International Social Science Bulletin.* Autumn, 1950.

Smith, Harry L. and Hyman, Herbert. The Biasing Effect of Interviewer Expectations on Survey Results. *Public Opinion Quarterly.* Fall, 1950.

Weschler, Irving R. and Bernberg, Raymond E. Indirect Methods of Attitude Measurement. *International Journal of Opinion and Attitude Research.* Summer, 1950.

Group Behavior

Bower, Robert T. Note on "Did Labor Support Jackson?: The Boston Story." *Political Science Quarterly.* September, 1950.

Dunlop, John T. and Whyte, William Foote. Framework for the Analysis of Industrial Relations: Two Views. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review.* April, 1950.

Hemphill, John K. Relations between the Size of the Group and the Behavior of "Superior" Leaders. *Journal of Social Psychology.* August, 1950.

Kitt, Alice S. and Gleicher, David B. Determinants of Voting Behavior. *Public Opinion Quarterly.* Fall, 1950.

Lazarsfeld, Paul F. Votes in the Making. *Scientific American.* November, 1950.

Nilson, Sten Sparre. Statistikk, Okonomi Og Statsvitenskap. *Statsøkonomisk Tidsskrift.* Number 2, 1950.

Schall, Herbert M., Levy, Bernard and Tresselt, M. E. A Sociometric Approach to Rumor. *Journal of Social Psychology.* February, 1950.

Schneider, Eugene V. Limitations on Observation in Industrial Sociology. *Social Forces.* March, 1950.

Shartle, Carroll L. Leadership Aspects of Administrative Behavior. *Advanced Management.* November, 1950.

Thibaut, John. An Experimental Study of the Cohesiveness of Underprivileged Groups. *Human Relations.* Volume 3, Number 3, 1950.

Thompson, Laura. Personality and Government. Findings and Recommendations of the Indian Administration Research. *America Indigena.* July, 1950.

Culture and Institutions

Cattell, Raymond B. The Principal Culture Patterns Discoverable in the Syntal Dimensions of Existing Nations. *Journal of Social Psychology.* November, 1950.

Farber, Maurice L. The Problem of National Character: A Methodological Analysis. *Journal of Psychology.* October, 1950.

Goldschmidt, Walter. Social Class in America—A Critical Review. *American Anthropologist.* October–December, 1950.

Heimann, Eduard. On Economic Planning. *Social Research.* September, 1950.

Kapp, K. William. Economic Planning and Freedom. *Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv.* fasc. 1., 1950.

Lindesmith, Alfred R. and Strauss, Anselm L. A Critique of Culture-Personality Writings. *American Sociological Review.* October, 1950.

Seeldrayers, Ed.-Pierre. Elements d'une Theorie Générale de l'Administration Publique. *Revue Internationale des Sciences Administratives.* 1950.

Summers, H. F. The Idea of Responsibility in Government. *Public Administration.* Summer, 1950.

OTHER BOOKS RECEIVED

ALY, BOWER (ED.). *Welfare State; The Twenty-Fourth Annual Debate Handbook.* Columbia, Missouri: Artcraft Press. 1950. 2 Vols. Pp. 220, 220.

ATTEBERRY, GEORGE C., ET AL. *Introduction to Social Science; A Survey of Social Problems.* Vol. II. New York: Macmillan Company. Revised issue. 1950. Pp. xxiii, 823. $5.00.

BARCK, OSCAR THEODORE, JR., WAKEFIELD, WALTER L. AND LEFLER, HUGH TALMAGE. *The United States; A Survey of National Development.* New York: Ronald Press Company. 1950. Pp. x, 1079. $6.00.

BARRY, COLMAN J. *The Catholic University of America 1903–1909; The Rectorship of Denis J. O'Connell.* Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press. 1950. Pp. xi, 298. $3.50.

BARTLEY, ERNEST R. AND BOYER, WILLIAM W., JR. *Municipal Zoning; Florida Law and Practice.* Gainesville: University of Florida. 1950. Pp. 90.

BECKETT, SIR ERIC (FOREWORD BY). *Manual of German Law; Volume 1, General Introduction, Civil and Commercial Law.* London: His Majesty's Stationery Office. 1950. Pp. xxvi, 297. £1 5s.

BOULDING, KENNETH E. *A Reconstruction of Economics.* New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. 1950. Pp. xiii, 311. $4.50.

DANIELS, WALTER M. (COMP.). *Should We Have More TVA's?* New York: H. W. Wilson Company. 1950. Pp. 225. $1.75.

FREEDMAN, PAUL. *The Principles of Scientific Research.* Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press. 1950. Pp. xi, 222. $3.25.

FYZEE, ASAF A. *Outlines of Muhammadan Law.* New York: Oxford University Press. 1950. Pp. xvi, 443. $5.00.

GERSTELL, RICHARD. *How to Survive an Atomic Bomb.* Washington, D.C.: Combat Forces Press. 1950. Pp. 150. $1.95.

GIBBS, HENRY. *Twilight in South Africa.* New York: Philosophical Library. 1950. Pp. 288. $4.50.

GRAVES, PHILIP (ED.). *Memoirs of King Abdullah of Transjordan.* New York: Philosophical Library. 1950. Pp. 278. $3.75.

GREEN, A. WIGFALL. *The Epic of Korea.* Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press. 1950. Pp. 136. $2.50.

HALÉVY, ELIE. *The Triumph of Reform, 1830–1841; A History of the English People in the Nineteenth Century.* Vol. III. Trans. by E. I. WATKINS. New York: Peter Smith. 1950. Pp. viii, 364. $6.00.

KENDRICK, M. SLADE. *Public Finance; Principles and Problems.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1951. Pp. xii, 708. $5.25.

LEAKE, CHAUNCEY D. AND ROMANELL, PATRICK. *Can We Agree? A Scientist and Philosopher Argue about Ethics.* Austin: University of Texas Press. 1950. Pp. xiii, 110.

LEVITAN, SAR A. *Ingrade Wage-Rate Progression in War and Peace; A Problem in Wage Administration Techniques.* Plattsburg, New York: Clinton Press, Inc. 1950. Pp. viii, 141. $2.50.

LIPSON, E. *The Growth of English Society; A Short Economic History.* New York: Henry Holt and Company. 1950. Pp. ix, 467. $5.00.

MORISON, SAMUEL ELIOT AND COMMAGER, HENRY STEELE. *The Growth of the American Republic; Vol. I—1800–1865; Vol. II—1865–1950.* New York: Oxford University Press. 1950. Pp. xvi, 825; xvii, 974. $5.50 each volume.

NUSSBAUM, ARTHUR. *Money in the Law National and International; A Comparative Study in the Borderline of Law and Economics.* Brooklyn: Foundation Press, Inc. Revised issue. 1950. Pp. xxxii, 618. $8.00.

O'CONNOR, HARVEY. *History of Oil Workers International Union—CIO.* Denver: Oil Workers Int'l Union (CIO). 1950. Pp. xiv, 442.

SINGER, DOROTHEA WALEY. *Giordano Bruno, His Life and Thought; With Annotated Translation of His Work on the Infinite Universe and Worlds.* New York: Henry Schuman. 1950. Pp. xi, 389. $6.00.

WEBER, MAX. *General Economic History.* Trans. by FRANK H. KNIGHT. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press. 1950. Pp. xvi, 401. $4.50.

WEISS-ROSMARIN, TRUDE. *Jerusalem.* New York: Philosophical Library. 1950. Pp. xii, 51. $2.75.

WINSTEDT, RICHARD. *The Malays; A Cultural History.* New York: Philosophical Library. 1950. Pp. vii, 198. $3.75.

WISH, HARVEY. *Society and Thought in Early America; A Social and Intellectual History of the American People through 1865.* New York: Longmans, Green and Company, Inc. 1950. Pp. xii, 612. $4.75.

SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

1951

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Peter H. Odegard, *Chairman*, University of California (Berkeley)
Luther H. Gulick, Institute of Public Administration
Edward H. Litchfield, American Political Science Association
J. A. C. Grant, University of California (Los Angeles)
Pendleton Herring, Social Science Research Council
Francis O. Wilcox, Foreign Relations Committee, United States Senate

NOMINATING COMMITTEE

Charles M. Kneier, *Chairman*, University of Illinois
Thomas S. Barclay, Stanford University
Charles E. Martin, University of Washington
James M. Burns, Williams College
James L. McCamy, University of Wisconsin
Cullen B. Gosnell, Emory University

PROGRAM COMMITTEE

J. A. C. Grant, *Chairman*, University of California (Los Angeles)
M. Margaret Ball, Wellesley College
Hugh A. Bone, University of Washington
G. Homer Durham, University of Utah
Merle Fainsod, Harvard University
James W. Fesley, University of North Carolina
Joseph P. Harris, University of California (Berkeley)
Arnaud B. Leavelle, Stanford University
Benjamin E. Lippincott, University of Minnesota
R. W. Van Wagenen, Princeton University
Schuyler C. Wallace, Columbia University
Francis O. Wilcox, Staff, Foreign Relations Committee, United States Senate

Members of the Association are urged to forward their suggestions to the Chairmen of the Nominating and Program Committees at their earliest convenience.

The membership of other committees of the Association will be announced in the June issue of the REVIEW.

Copies of the *final* program of the 1950 meeting of the Association, held in Washington, D.C., on Dec. 28–30, are available on request from the Executive Director, American Political Science Association, 1785 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Washington 6, D.C.

The report of the Association's Committee on the Advancement of Teaching Political Science, entitled *Goals for Political Science*, will be published late this spring by William Sloane Associates of New York. The report will be the basis of discussion at a session of the San Francisco conference of the Association in August.

OFFICERS OF THE AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION

President

Peter H. Odegard
University of California (Berkeley)

President-Elect

Luther H. Gulick
Institute of Public Administration

Vice-Presidents

Paul H. Appleby
Syracuse University

J. Alton Burdine
University of Texas

George B. Galloway
Legislative Reference Service
Library of Congress

Secretary-Treasurer

Edward H. Litchfield
1785 Massachusetts Ave., N.W.
Washington 6, D.C.

Managing Editor
American Political Science Review

Taylor Cole
Duke University

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

Above-named Officers *ex officiis*

Robert K. Carr
Dartmouth College

G. Homer Durham
University of Utah

Albert Lepawsky
University of Alabama

Harvey C. Mansfield
Ohio State University

Carl B. Swisher
Johns Hopkins University

Kenneth C. Cole
University of Washington

John D. Millett
Columbia University

Francis O. Wilcox
Staff, Foreign Relations Committee,
United States Senate

M. Margaret Ball
Wellesley College

Wilfred E. Binkley
Ohio Northern University

Ray F. Harvey
New York University

Royden J. Dangerfield
University of Illinois

Alpheus T. Mason
Princeton University

James L. McCamy
University of Wisconsin

Roy V. Peel
Director of the Bureau
of the Census

Edward W. Weidner
Michigan State College

FORMER PRESIDENTS

Frank J. Goodnow
Albert Shaw
Frederic N. Judson
James Bryce
A. Lawrence Lowell
Woodrow Wilson
Simeon E. Baldwin
Albert Bushnell Hart
W. W. Willoughby
John Bassett Moore
Ernst Freund
Jesse Macy
Munro Smith
Henry Jones Ford
Paul S. Reinsch

Leo S. Rowe
William A. Dunning
Harry A. Garfield
James W. Garner
Charles E. Merriam
Charles A. Beard
William B. Munro
Jesse S. Reeves
John A. Fairlie
Benjamin F. Shambaugh
Edward S. Corwin
William F. Willoughby
Isidor Loeb
Walter J. Shepard
Francis W. Coker

Arthur N. Holcombe
Thomas Reed Powell
Clarence A. Dykstra
Charles Grove Haines
Robert C. Brooks
Frederic A. Ogg
William Anderson
Robert E. Cushman
Leonard D. White
John M. Gaus
Walter F. Dodd
Arthur W. Macmahon
Henry R. Spencer
Quincy Wright
James K. Pollock

The Case for Conservatism

by Francis Graham Wilson

Whether you consider yourself a liberal or conservative, Dr. Wilson's case will help to clarify your political thinking. A timely, clear, and intelligent discussion by a leading political scientist and writer. **$1.75**

UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP and Qualifications for Voting in Washington

by Ernest H. Campbell and George D. Smith

Only manual of its kind. Combines US constitutional provisions, laws, and court decisions. About 90% of the material is national in scope. **$1.50**

University of Washington Press
Seattle 5

Copies of back issues of the **AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE REVIEW** can be obtained at the following prices: Vols. I-V (1906-1911) $3.50 per copy, except Nov. 1906 (unavailable) and Nov. 1909, $10.00, Nov. 1911, $10.00. Vols. VI-IX (1912-1915), $1.50 per copy, except Nov. 1913, $7.50 per copy. Vol. X (1916) $2.00 per copy. Vols. XI-XVII (1917-1923) $1.50 per copy. Vols. XVIII-XXVII (1924-1933) $1.50 per copy. Vol. XXVIII (1934) $2.00 per copy. Vols. XXIX-XXXI (1935-1937) $2.25 per copy. Vols. XXXII-XXXV (1936-1941) $2.00 per copy except April, Oct. 1938, Dec. 1939, June, Aug. 1940, $1.50 per copy. Vols. XXXVI and XXXVII (1942-1943) $1.50 per copy except Oct. 1943, $7.50 per copy. Vol. XXXVIII (1944) $2.00 per copy except June, 1944, $5.00 per copy. Vol. XXXIX (1945) $2.00 per copy except Oct. 1945, $7.50 per copy. Vols. XL-XLIV (1946-1950) $1.50 per copy except Feb. 1948, $7.70 per copy, April 1949, $10.00 per copy, March 1950, $10.00 per copy. General Index, Vols. I-XX, $2.00. Prices for complete volumes furnished on request. Postage extra. Prices are subject to change. Address all orders and remittances to: The American Political Science Association, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Announcing Two Publications

STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN THE UNITED STATES

WILLIAM ANDERSON, *University of Minnesota*

EDWARD W. WEIDNER, *Michigan State College*

This new text is an integrated treatment of state and local governments, stressing their interdependence and emphasizing the enormous growth in the last fifty years of their services and problems. The full discussion of local government, both rural and urban, is a major contribution to the literature in the field. The authors not only cover the important historical and constitutional phases, but stress the human relations approach and give a new treatment of the functions of government and the process by which public policies are determined. Accompanying each chapter is a list of suggested projects designed to give the student a practical understanding of state and local governments in the area in which he lives. Many unusual and interesting illustrations are included.

Ready in June *Approximately 700 pages* *About $4.50*

READINGS IN LATIN AMERICAN GOVERNMENT

ASHER N. CHRISTENSEN, *University of Minnesota*

This new volume of readings contains over forty selections, carefully chosen to throw light on the functions of government characteristic of Latin America. They include articles from leading magazines, standard works, and several studies especially written for this book. In addition to the specific articles on the functions of government, there are discussions of general topics such as the influence of geography, the economic structure, the church, and the military as conditioning factors in government. The part titles indicate the scope of the book: I. The Heritage of the Past; II. The Basic Conditioning Factors; III. The Constitutional Bases of Government; IV. The Organization and Institutions of Government; V. The Work of Contemporary Latin American Government. Part V deals with the major governmental programs in the fields of land reform, industrialization, education, social welfare, and foreign relations.

Ready in June *Approximately 600 pages* *About $4.50*

HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY 257 Fourth Avenue, New York 10

Important New Texts

AMERICAN CONSTITUTIONAL DECISIONS, Revised Edition

By Charles Fairman. The revised edition includes 36 fundamental Constitutional decisions, with analyses. It is thoroughly up to date, incorporating cases decided in the June, 1950, session of Court. *1950 489 pages $2.75*

THE PEOPLE, POLITICS AND THE POLITICIAN, Revised Edition

By A. N. Christensen and E. M. Kirkpatrick. Half of the 120 selections are new in this revision of a leading book of readings in American Government.
1950 1042 pages College edition Cloth $4.50; paper $3.25

AMERICAN CITY GOVERNMENT, Revised Edition

By William Anderson and Edward W. Weidner. In this revision the material has been rewritten and reorganized to bring both facts and viewpoint completely up to date.
1950 625 pages $4.50

A DIPLOMATIC HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES, Third Edition

By Samuel Flagg Bemis. This distinguished text traces the diplomatic history of the United States through the aftermath of World War II and analyzes the guiding principles of American foreign policy to the present time.
1950 994 pages College edition $5.75

THE UNITED STATES AS A WORLD POWER, A Diplomatic History, 1900-1950

By Samuel Flagg Bemis. Adapted from Part III of *A Diplomatic History of the United States,* Third Edition, this volume provides an excellent comprehensive treatment of foreign policy for courses in American diplomacy since 1900.
1950 491 pages College edition $3.75

THE GOVERNMENTS OF FOREIGN POWERS, Revised Edition

By Philip W. Buck and John W. Masland. Greatly enlarged, the revised edition of this text in comparative government presents a complete and thoroughly up-to-date account of the governments of Britain, France, Italy, Germany, Russia, Japan, and China. *1950 948 pages $4.25*

A HISTORY OF POLITICAL THEORY, Revised Edition

By George H. Sabine. The revision of this outstanding publication constitutes a completely up-to-date survey of the development of political theory in the Western World.
1950 934 pages $4.60

MAIN CURRENTS IN MODERN POLITICAL THOUGHT

By John H. Hallowell. This scholarly work covers the main currents in modern political thought since the sixteenth century, concentrating specifically on political trends since the rise of liberalism in the eighteenth century. *1950 759 pages $4.25*

HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY 257 Fourth Avenue, New York 10

Principles and Problems of American National Government

By JOHN M. SWARTHOUT
Professor of Political Science, Oregon State College

and ERNEST R. BARTLEY
Assistant Professor of Political Science, University of Florida

Designed to be covered in a semester or quarter; emphasizing underlying ideas and issues; giving an analytical form to detailed information; lively, lucid, and straightforward in style—this is a book which promises to be regarded as a major contribution.

Charles S. Hyneman, Northwestern University, says of it: 'I read every chapter of the text carefully in galley proofs. I believe I am reasonably familiar with the other textbooks designed for the beginning course in American government. Swarthout and Bartley satisfy me better than any other. I think they show excellent judgment as to what is significant for the introduction of young people to the study of government and politics, and I think they show great skill in presenting those things which they think the beginning student should know about. The two introductory chapters are superb. If one likes to start with an explanation of how American government and politics grew out of English institutions and ways, he should find the opening chapters of this book virtually ideal.'

700 pages Published 11 January $4.25

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

FREE GOVERNMENT IN THE MAKING:

Readings in American Political Thought

By ALPHEUS THOMAS MASON
Princeton University

A distinguished first-hand introduction to the controversies that have gone into the development of our political tradition. Teachers and reviewers are very nearly unanimous in calling this the best book of its kind available, and their opinion is borne out by a still growing list of adoptions. 846 pages. $6.00.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS:

Readings and Documents

By NORMAN HILL
University of Nebraska

Well selected, well integrated, and brilliantly planned—that is the verdict of professors concerning this new, comprehensive source book and text. The materials have been gathered from widely scattered sources and arranged under four major headings: International Relations and Organization; Power Politics and War; World Economic and Social Problems; The Individual and the World of Ideas. 536 pages. $4.50.

RADIO, TELEVISION, AND SOCIETY

By CHARLES A. SIEPMANN
New York University

An entirely new kind of textbook, which takes the materials of social science out of the realm of the specialist and places them in a frame of reference familiar to everyone. Harwood L. Childs, Princeton University, says of it: "Exceptionally good analysis from the public interest point of view. I intend to use it as one of the texts in my Public Opinion course." 416 pages. College edition $3.50.

114 Fifth Avenue, New York 11, N.Y.

Covering the administration of all public business—

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

in a Democratic Society

W. Brooke Graves

Senior Specialist in American Government and Administration, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress

Viewing administrative processes as a whole, the author brings his wide experience in state and national management problems to bear on the essential elements in administration—organization, personnel, finance, internal management, and the execution of policy. Illustrative material is drawn from the national and state governments, often in parallel, with attention to the same problems in municipalities. The book stresses the importance of, and means for, popular control of the administrative process in a democratic society. Selected references include books, and articles in current periodicals and professional journals. 775 pages. $6.25 list.

D. C. HEATH AND COMPANY

College Department: 285 Columbus Ave., Boston 16, Mass.

available April . . .

AMERICAN DEMOCRACY IN THEORY AND PRACTICE

Robert K. Carr, Donald H. Morrison (Dartmouth College)
and Marver H. Bernstein, Richard C. Snyder (Princeton)
probably 1024 pages, $5.00

A systematic survey of American National Government combined with an analysis of political principles and processes. It emphasizes current problems of public policy and provides several sections on civil rights, foreign relations, and the human side of government, with chapters on the Politician, the Congressman, the Judge, and the Civil Servant.

revised edition

AMERICAN GOVERNMENT IN ACTION, Rev.

Marshall E. Dimock and Gladys O. Dimock
available April, probably 1024 pages, $5.00

This is a complete revision. Although the treatment and fundamental outline are unchanged, there has been a rearrangement of the order of some chapters, a condensation of others, the inclusion of additional illustrative matter, and much rewriting throughout. It incorporates all the changes in the past five years in program and governmental operation. Historical material which goes beyond the course has been eliminated.

just published

THE BACKGROUND OF EUROPEAN GOVERNMENTS, 3rd Ed.

Norman L. Hill, University of Nebraska
Harold W. Stoke, formerly President, Louisiana State University
Carl J. Schneider, University of Nebraska
608 pages, $2.75

A collection of readings designed to furnish documentary, illustrative, and interpretive material in the field of European comparative government. It covers England, U.S.S.R., France, Italy, and Germany. Including official documents, analytical writings, and editorial introductions, the book may be used either as a supplementary or basic text.

a revealing study

CONGRESS: Corruption and Compromise

H. H. Wilson, Princeton University
just published, 337 pages, $2.00

A penetrating analysis of the standards of conduct maintained by Congressmen in office. It attempts to deal with the sources of unethical conduct in American society. The general conclusion is that violations of ethical standards by Congressmen derive from their following practices which are accepted as natural in other occupations in American society. The chapter dealing with British practices provides an illuminating contrast.

books which may be adopted for course use are available as complimentary examination copies

RINEHART & CO.
232 madison avenue
new york 16, new york

Princeton
UNIVERSITY PRESS

The Open Society and its Enemies

By K. R. POPPER. "Popper demonstrates that Plato, Hegel, and Marx formulated ideas in political philosophy inimical to the 'Open Society,' i.e., to a society based on reason and not on myth. . . . This unprejudiced defense of the individual and his rights is one of the most urgent needs of Western civilization. . . . A sincerity and originality of judgment seldom to be found in contemporary writing on political philosophy."—*Saturday Review.* Mr. Popper is a philosopher and logician at the London School of Economics and the University of London. Revised, one vol. edition, $7.50

The Population of India and Pakistan

by KINGSLEY DAVIS. The most thoroughgoing analysis of Indian population data yet published, profusely illustrated with maps and charts. This book deals analytically with the whole economic and social structure of the Indian region. Kingsley Davis is director of the Bureau of Applied Social Research at Columbia; the book was editorially sponsored by the Princeton Office of Population Research. $7.50

AT YOUR BOOKSTORE *PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS*

Outstanding texts . . .

GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS IN THE UNITED STATES

Third Edition

By Harold Zink

In this completely revised text, the author deals with the functions of American government, historical development, and the role of the United States in international affairs. Much new material has been added in the light of recent world events and the bibliographies have been brought up-to-date. *Revised Edition, To Be Published, April 1951*

PRINCIPLES OF BUSINESS AND THE FEDERAL LAW

By Franklin H. Cook

This book summarizes clearly and in a self-explanatory manner the constitutional and legal principles that affect and govern the relation of government to business and to labor. Cases are used to trace the development of these principles to illustrate their application. *To Be Published, March-April 1951*

MODERN FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS

By Ogg and Zink

Successor to Ogg's *European Government and Politics,* this text is a study of the political development and political institutions of the great powers, as well as of some of the smaller nations. Backgrounds of political institutions are given careful consideration and present organization and operations are treated in detail. *$6.00*

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
60 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Men of Good Hope

A Story of American Progressives

By DANIEL AARON. In this timely revaluation of the progressive idea in America, the author analyzes the social philosophy of such nineteenth-century reformers as Theodore Parker, Henry George, Edward Bellamy, William Dean Howells and Thorstein Veblen and evaluates the part each played in the development of the progressive movement. He then demonstrates the difference in attitude, and consequently in action, between Emerson's "men of good hope" and the latter-day exponents of an opportunistic progressivism—from Brooks Adams, Theodore Roosevelt, and Woodrow Wilson through Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Mr. Aaron's implied thesis is that an effective liberalism can be achieved by combining the techniques and practical approach to politics of the pragmatic progressives with the utopian vision of the old reformers. $4.00

Freedom, Power, and Democratic Planning

By KARL MANNHEIM, Late Professor of Sociology in the Institute of Education, London University

One of the most brilliant sociologists of our time here offers a body of principles on which we can build the kind of society we want, incorporating the lessons of the last decades into a new pattern of democracy. "Helps to clear up many political and economical confusions of our time."—*San Francisco Chronicle.* $5.00

At all bookstores or from the publisher

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
114 Fifth Avenue, New York 11, New York

Principles and Problems of International Politics

Selected Readings

Edited by HANS J. MORGENTHAU, *University of Chicago*
and KENNETH W. THOMPSON, *Northwestern University*

"It is an excellent job, both in terms of organization and in terms of the materials reprinted. It hould have a wide use in all courses in International Relations and International Politics. An maginative and scholarly book."

—Peter H. Odegard, *University of California*
494 pages; $4.00 text

The Administration of American Foreign Affairs

by JAMES L. McCAMY, *University of Wisconsin*

"I like very much McCamy's urbane iconoclasm. His book is an interesting combination of factual nformation and lively writing. He has written by far the most sprightly account of a neglected phase f our foreign policy in the making."

—Norman D. Palmer, *University of Pennsylvania*
702 pages; $4.00 text

The Governmental Process

Political Interests and Public Opinion

by DAVID B. TRUMAN, *Williams College*

A survey—fresh, penetrating, and exhaustive—of the entire governmental process, with special eference to the role of public opinion, propaganda, and group interests as they influence all branches f government—Congress, the Presidency, and the Courts. This original study provides an invaluable upplement to courses in political parties, public opinion, and propaganda.

Spring. Details to be announced.

Public and Republic

Political Representation in America

by ALFRED DE GRAZIA, *Brown University*

The many conflicting interests which have pressed for, and profoundly influenced, political represenation in this country are here examined through the course of three centuries. Landed property, ectional groupings, commercial interests, all have held their own beliefs in specific devices for repreenting the values which they consider most important. The description and analysis of these theories s the theme of this study.

Just published. 284 pages; $3.50 text

Outstanding Among American Government Texts:

A Grammar of American Politics

The National Government

by WILFRED E. BINKLEY, *Ohio Northern University*
and MALCOLM C. MOOS, *The Johns Hopkins University*

A *fresh* approach to the study of American government, remarkable for its easy readability, for its nclusive view of the processes of American political life, and for its lively presentation of essential facts.

788 pages; $4.50 text

Examination copies on request

ALFRED A. KNOPF, Inc. **501 Madison Avenue** **NEW YORK 22**

Important

McGRAW-HILL

Books

STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT. In the United States

By William Vernon Holloway, University of Tulsa. *McGraw-Hill Series in Political Science.* 460 pages, $3.75

Includes a brief, teachable discussion of national-state-local relations, with special attention given to the trend toward centralization and the problems raised thereby. Combines the various units of government, exclusive of national, into a single up-to-date volume; supplies basic facts, discusses controversial issues, and stimulates constructive thinking and criticism of state and local government institutions.

BASIC DOCUMENTS OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Edited by Frederick H. Hartmann, The University of Florida. *McGraw-Hill Series in Political Science.* 312 pages, $3.25

Here is an excellent new volume for supplementary use in courses on international relations. The author brings together in one book a judicious selection of original documents usually covered in courses of this nature. Selections from the Holy Alliance to the Atlantic Pact are presented with emphasis on the period from 1918 to the present.

EUROPEAN AND COMPARATIVE GOVERNMENT

By Robert G. Neumann, University of California. *McGraw-Hill Series in Political Science.* In press

Divided into five major sections, this text covers the governments and politics of Great Britain, France, Germany, and the Soviet Union. A final section offers a comparative analysis of major institutions and phenomena of government throughout the world. The text leads the student to a critical and analytical comparison of existing institutions.

GOVERNMENTS IN MODERN SOCIETY

By G. Lowell Field, Wayne University. *McGraw-Hill Series in Political Science.* In press

A comparative government text with a functional approach. Instead of taking up the subject country by country, this book examines institutions such as political parties, executives, legislatures, revolutions and dictatorial systems. It then proceeds to analyze and compare the actual functionings in various nations of these particular institutions or concepts.

Send for copies on approval

McGRAW-HILL BOOK COMPANY, Inc.

330 West 42nd Street
New York 18, N.Y.

Each a Leader in Its Field . . .

Textbooks by AUSTIN F. MACDONALD

AMERICAN CITY GOVERNMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

Fifth Edition

"The most readable book in its field. I have used it for a number of years and am continuing to do so. The added material in this edition is most welcome."
—W. J. Ronan, *New York University*

"This volume is well organized, contains essential material, and presents it in a clear and orderly manner."
—George S. Miller, *Tufts College*

"I heartily welcome the new edition and will return to the use of the volume. It is, without question, the best text for a semester course in American Government and Administration."
—C. Edwin Gilmour, *Grinnell College*

"This revision has improved a book which was previously very good, especially on municipal administration. Happily, the list of references has been brought thoroughly up-to-date and the text reflects many significant new developments."
—R. T. Daland, *University of Alabama*

"My praise for this excellent book would be supererogatory. I shall have my students use it next term along with the author's *State Government.*"
—William M. Canning, *Xavier University, Cincinnati*

1951 · 699 pages · 41 charts and tables · $4.50

AMERICAN STATE GOVERNMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

Fourth Edition

"An up-to-date revision of a basically sound and readable text. Typography easy on the eyes. Excellent bibliographical aids."
—Lloyd M. Short, *University of Minnesota*

"I'm very much pleased with the fourth edition; the author has done an excellent job of bringing it up-to-date and still keeping it teachable."
—Harold B. Fortney, *Wittenberg College*

"Our students find Macdonald easy to understand."
—S. J. House, *University of Nebraska*

"Professor Macdonald's vivid and cogent style of writing is a delight to both student and instructor."
—A. C. Miller, Jr., *Wheaton College (Mass.)*

"It is the best I have seen on the subject."
—Homer Clevenger, *Lindenwood College*

"An excellent text."
—F. C. Sutherland, *Northwest Nazarene College*

"Very thorough in its coverage; particularly to be commended for its emphasis on state functions as well as organization."
—Coleman B. Ransome, Jr., *University of Alabama*

1950 · 722 pages · $4.50

LATIN AMERICAN POLITICS AND GOVERNMENT

"As it stands, the book is a very useful one. It gives a picture of governmental machinery and practice in Latin America that is more complete and more accurate than anything previously available to students."
—Dana G. Munro *(Princeton University),* in *The Hispanic American Historical Review*

1949 · 642 pages · Illustrated · $4.75

Send for copies on approval

THOMAS Y. CROWELL COMPANY
432 Fourth Avenue · New York 16, N.Y.

now available

- A book that promotes a new understanding of government-in-action

The Theory and Practice of
American National Government

CARL BRENT SWISHER
The Johns Hopkins University

In addition to giving the necessary facts of American national government, Dr. Swisher's book interprets and evaluates these facts, inviting the student to weigh the significance of what he reads. The approach is both descriptive and functional. Dr. Swisher describes and analyzes not merely diverse parts of governmental machinery and isolated governmental activities but also the integrated operations of our whole complex mechanism as it serves the even more complex needs of the American people.

In providing background material for the facts and functions of government, the author supplies anecdotes and personality studies which gives the book life and illuminate issues. The relation of the national government to the governments of the states and the local units is clearly shown in three chapters on federalism near the end of the book. In addition to a brilliant study of Congress, there are three penetrating chapters on the judiciary and law and four keenly analytical chapters on the conduct of American foreign affairs.

Houghton Mifflin Company

Boston New York
Chicago Dallas
San Francisco

WILLIAM SLOANE ASSOCIATES is privileged to announce the forthcoming publication of

Goals for Political Science

The Report of the Committee for the Advancement of Teaching, American Political Science Association

This important study, prepared by leading political scientists, has implications for the curriculum, content, and teaching methods of political science, for its integration with the other social sciences, and for better teamwork between high schools and colleges. It will be widely discussed throughout the profession.

(To appear in June) *(Approx. 225 pp., probably $2.00)*

Coming late in Spring is

A Short Guide to Public Affairs

by E. E. Schattschneider, Victor Jones, Stephen Bailey
all of *Wesleyan University*

How can the citizen get into politics? How can he get results in government? Where can he find out how to examine a budget or study a Congressional district, government agency, or Congressional hearing? Where can he look up a Congressman's record? All these questions and many more are answered in this useful Guide.

(To appear in July) *(Approx. 200 pp., probably $1.50)*

Published recently and well worth your attention and your students' study are:

Harvey–Skinner–Somit–Nealon
GOVERNMENT IN AMERICAN SOCIETY

Laing–Vernon–Eldersveld–Meisel–Pollock
SOURCE BOOKS IN EUROPEAN GOVERNMENTS

Clinton Rossiter
DOCUMENTS IN AMERICAN GOVERNMENT

Corwin and Peltason
UNDERSTANDING THE CONSTITUTION

WILLIAM SLOANE ASSOCIATES, INC.
119 West 57th St., New York 19

THE SOVIET UNION

Background, Ideology, Reality

Published by the Committee on International Relations of the University of Notre Dame, Indiana

Waldemar Gurian, chairman of the committee and editor of the REVIEW OF POLITICS, has written the introductory article, *From Lenin to Stalin*. Other articles are: *Historical Background of Soviet Thought Control* by Michael Karpovich of Harvard; *Methods of Soviet Penetration in Eastern Europe* by Stephen Kertesz of Notre Dame; *Soviet Exploitation of National Conflicts in Eastern Europe* by Philip E. Mosely of Columbia; *Aims and Methods of Soviet Terrorism* by Vladimir Petrov of Yale; *Economics of the Soviet Union* by Naum Jasny of Stanford; *Church and State in the Soviet Union* by Nicholas Timasheff of Fordham; *Church and State in Central Europe* by Francis Dvornik of Harvard.

Price: $3.50

Address your order to:

University of Notre Dame Press
Notre Dame, Indiana

Selected Volumes in the Field of Political Science

DEMOCRACY • *The Threshold of Freedom*

HAROLD F. GOSNELL, *American University.* "Suffrage," writes the author, "is but the threshold of freedom, not the throne." Here he marshals evidence to appraise, in terms of how they actually work, the two important democratic institutions of suffrage and representative government. The caliber of the people's representatives, negro suffrage, the competence of the voter, and the wording of state constitutions also come under analysis by this keen observer. *"Has all the earmarks of solid scholarship, plus inviting readability."*—Public Opinion Quarterly. 316 pages, $4.00

INTERNATIONAL GOVERNMENT

CLYDE EAGLETON, *New York University.* A revision of a successful textbook concerned with the evolution of constitutional law and the organization of the community of nations toward international, or world, government. Furnishes both the preliminary training needed for advanced courses in International Law and International Organization, and orientation in the subject for general readers. *"Instructive . . . urbane, good-humored."*—Annals of the American Academy of Social and Political Science. 554 pages, $5.00

THE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS

Lawmaking in the United States

HARVEY WALKER, *The Ohio State University.* Describes the function of lawmaking, or politics, for the various divisions of the American governmental system, from Congress down to the city council. Typical of the author's thoroughness are complete chapters on such topics as Legislative Records, Research in the Legislative Process, and Principles of Legislative Drafting. *"Useful as a handbook for legislators . . . as well as for text purposes in university and college courses in legislation."*—Annals of the American Academy of Social and Political Science. *482 pages, $5.00*

THE ADMINISTRATIVE STATE

Study of the Political Theory of American Public Administration

DWIGHT WALDO, *University of California.* This work bridges the gap between the studies of political theory and public administration. The author has studied the literature and here summarizes and interprets his findings. *"Professor Waldo has made the perilous trip from the spectral realm of political theory to the . . . practical world of public administration. The result is a major contribution to the literature of public administration."*—American Political Science Review. 227 pages, $3.25

Just Published . . .

THE POLITICS OF CALIFORNIA

A Book of Readings

DAVID FARRELLY, *Assistant Professor of Political Science; and* IVAN HINDERAKER, *Assistant Professor of Political Science; both of the University of California at Los Angeles.* A collection of 35 articles, extracts from books, judicial opinions, and other materials of wide political interest. The topics cover both major problems of local import in one of the fastest-growing states in the Union, and those involving relations with the national government. Each selection is introduced and oriented to the California scene by the compilers; authors of articles are identified in biographical notes at the back of the book. The volume is intended to be used as a supplementary text in the study of American government, state and local government, political parties, and legislatures and legislation. 320 pages, $3.25

THE RONALD PRESS COMPANY 15 East 26th St., New York 10

THE BEGINNINGS OF DIPLOMACY

By RAGNAR NUMELIN, Ph.D.

Member, Scientific Society of Finland
Finnish Minister to Belgium

This sociological study of intertribal and international relations utilizes the social-anthropological method of investigation rather than the conventional political-historical approach. Diplomacy is surveyed from the Babylonian Empire to the present day.

FROM THE CONTENTS

Society, Government, Law, and Custom
Communication during Time of War
Stranger and Guest
The First Diplomats
Envoys and Their Credentials
Peacemakers and Emissaries of War
The Green Branch
The Right of Asylum
Trade as Promoter of Intertribal and International Interests
The Development of Diplomacy
The Future of Diplomacy in Western Civilization

$12.00

Expedite shipment by prepayment

PHILOSOPHICAL LIBRARY

15 EAST 40th STREET, Desk 288 NEW YORK 16, N.Y.

Roots of Political Behavior

INTRODUCTION TO GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

Richard Carlton Snyder and H. Hubert Wilson
Associate Professors of Politics, Princeton University

One reviewer had this to say:

". . . The authors know that it is no longer necessary to argue that economic sociology, psychology, and anthropology can and do make important contribution to the understanding of the political behavior of men. To maintain that ma is a rational being is a daring enterprise which is not attempted by Professo Snyder and Wilson. The selections do not emphasize any particular theory an the range of subjects is very wide.

"The book portrays well the interrelations of the social sciences in the fo mation and expression of political opinion and action. It should serve as welcome antidote to students who have been forced in their study of governme to undergo the systematic regimentation of multitudinous and arid details.

from a review by Thomas S. Barclay of Stanford Universit
in the June, 1949, issue of the *Western Political Quarter*

American Book Company

55 Fifth Avenue, New York 3, N.Y. 300 Pike Street, Cincinnati 2, Ohio 351 East Ohio Street, Chicago 11, Il

Announcing a New Publication:

Manual of Political Geography

by Dr. JOHN E. KIEFFER

For use in Geopolitics, World Problems, Political Geography, and International Affairs courses.

This 72 page manual contains 32 exercises which are adaptable to all standard textbooks. Each exercise contains one or more outline maps for the students' use.

KG201 Manual of Political Geography Single copy, $2.50 postpaid. 20 or more, $2.00 per copy, postage extra.

Send your name, school, and department for complete information on this new teaching aid.

New Catalog #51 just from the press lists maps, atlases, student materials for Political Science.

DENOYER-GEPPERT COMPANY

5235 Ravenswood Ave. **Chicago 40, Illinois**

NEW BOOKS IN THE FIELD OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

For the Politician and Scholar:

ON THE CITY COUNCIL

by

ARTHUR W. BROMAGE, Professor of Political Science, University of Michigan. Postpaid $1.00.

For the Historian and Political Scientist:

THE TERRITORIAL DELEGATE TO CONGRESS AND OTHER ESSAYS

by

EVERETT S. BROWN, Professor of Political Science, University of Michigan, Postpaid $3.00.

For the Student of Comparative Government, Especially of Russia:

MATERIALS FOR THE STUDY OF THE SOVIET SYSTEM

by

James H. Meisel, Assistant Professor of Political Science, University of Michigan, and Edward S. Kozera. Postpaid $5.50.

Order from George Wahr Publishing Company

105 North Main Street **Ann Arbor, Michigan**

●

WANTED

Back Issues of the Review

Only copies in good condition will be accepted.

Five dollars will be paid for the following issues: Nov. 1906, Nov. 1909, Nov. 1911 and Nov. 1913.

Two dollars will be paid for the following issues: Oct. 1943, Oct. 1945, Feb. 1948, Apr. 1949 and March 1950.

Fifty cents will be paid for each copy of the following issues: Feb., May and Aug. 1907; Feb., May and Nov. 1908; Feb., May and Aug. 1909; Aug. 1910; Nov. 1911; Nov. 1931; Feb. 1940; Feb. 1941; Feb., Oct. and Dec. 1943; Feb., Apr. and June 1944; Oct. 1945; Feb., Aug. and Oct. 1946; Feb. 1948.

Twenty-five cents will be paid for the following issues: Feb. 1917; Feb., May and Nov. 1927; Feb. 1928; May, Aug. and Nov. 1929; Feb. and Dec. 1934; Dec. 1935; Feb., Apr., June, Aug., Oct. and Dec. 1936; Feb. and Oct. 1937; June 1938.

●

EDWARD H. LITCHFIELD, *Executive Director*
American Political Science Association
1785 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

●

PUBLIC AFFAIRS ABSTRACTS

"The Congressman's Digest"

Prepared by the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, this publication summarizes the contents of the most significant publications dealing with problems or situations of concern to Congress. Each issue contains a short analysis of a problem, including its background and proposals advanced for its solution, and indicates the status of pending legislation. The 1950 issues included such subjects as Social Security, National Health Insurance, Statehood for Alaska and Hawaii, and Educational Issues Before the Congress.

Among the subjects to be covered in 1951 are the following:

Civil Defense
Democracy and Communism
Loyalty, Security, and Freedom
Valley Authorities
The United States and China

Persons who wish to subscribe may send a check or money order to the Card Division, Library of Congress, Washington 25, D.C., made payable to the Librarian of Congress. The subscription price for one year is $5.75 and the price of a single issue is 30 cents. Approximately 20 issues are published each year. There is available a limited number of 1950 sets. Subscriptions will begin when received unless back copies are specifically requested.

For authoritative analyses of political and social trends throughout the Soviet orbit

THE AMERICAN SLAVIC AND EAST EUROPEAN REVIEW

Entering its tenth year as a quarterly under the editorship of scholars from nine Universities.

Special attention is now given the social sciences.

JOHN N. HAZARD: *Managing Editor*
Subscriptions: $5.00 a year, payable to
Columbia University Press, Room 705,
2960 Broadway, New York 27, N.Y.

VAN NOSTRAND
FOR COLLEGE TEXTS

Coming in April . . . Second Edition

FOUNDATIONS OF NATIONAL POWER

(Readings on World Politics and American Security)

By HAROLD and MARGARET SPROUT

Harold Sprout is Professor of Political Science and Chairman,
Department of Politics, Princeton University

FOUNDATIONS OF NATIONAL POWER—SECOND Edition is still a book of readings drawn from many sources and representing many fields of knowledge. As in the first edition, a roster of the authorities quoted includes eminent statesmen, political scientists, historians, economists, geologists, engineers, physical scientists, geographers, demographers, journalists and military experts, *each of whom makes his own contribution to an understanding and solution of the international problems of our time.*

MOST IMPORTANT REVISIONS INCLUDE:

- **Two-thirds to three-fourths of the readings are *new.***
- **Original and introductory writing by the authors has been *completely revised*, and considerably expanded.**
- **Changes have been made in the arrangement of material *to reflect the latest phase of the world situation.***

DESIGNED for general introductory courses, but also useful in many advanced courses. *Can be adapted* for either a one or a two-semester course. For a two-semester course the text could be combined with a conventional text or with specialized library assignments. Chapter Introductions set single column. Readings set double column. **820 pp., approx. 6½ x 9½, Cloth.**

Coming in April . . .

RUSSIA: PAST AND PRESENT

By Anatole G. Mazour, Stanford University

An 800-page history, topically, instead of chronologically arranged. Begins with the 15th century and ends with the outbreak of the Korean War.

IF YOU TEACH OR DIRECT SUITABLE COURSES, EXAMINATION COPIES ARE AVAILABLE UPON REQUEST

D. VAN NOSTRAND COMPANY, INC.
PUBLISHERS SINCE 1848
250 FOURTH AVENUE NEW YORK 3, NEW YORK